CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 12. MARCH, 1937. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Modern Churchmen in Conference.

Three and twenty years ago in the glorious summer which preceded the Great War the first Modern Churchmen's Conference was held at Ripon where, with the enthusiastic support of Dean Fremantle, the members of the Conference were enabled to use the Cathedral for their services. One of the Conference preachers on that occasion was Dr. E. W. Barnes, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, but few of the leaders in that Conference are with us to-day.

Thereafter, the Conference of Modern Churchmen became an annual institution and the most important occasion for the treatment of religious and ecclesiastical problems by Liberal or Modernist Churchmen. These conferences have attracted wide publicity and have done not a little to influence religious thinking in this country and outside it. By securing publicity for Modernist thought and teaching these conferences broke up effectually the conspiracy of silence which had been so widely prevalent in Church circles. They served also another purpose. They helped to bring together in pleasant social contact on the basis of common religious and intellectual interests those who

hitherto had been dwelling very largely in isolation. The mutual society help and comfort provided for Modernists by these conferences was hardly less valuable than their contribution to the liberation of theological thought and ecclesiastical policy.

Possibly the need for these conferences is less to-day than in times past. Some would even maintain that their work of liberation and education is done and so the need for their continuance has ceased. It is true that they have been characterized by a seriousness and solidity in dealing with religious problems which belongs rather to the past than to the present. Religion to-day is more a matter of taste and emotion than of serious intellectual effort and intense moral responsibility for the holding of right religious convictions. Moreover, religion is closely associated to-day with a host of economic, social and political problems and reforming efforts. The older Modernist felt himself to be faced by the problem of how to preach to empty heads : the newer Modernist of how to preach to empty bellies.

The twenty-fourth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen takes place at Girton College, Cambridge, on August 30 —September 4 of this year. Those interested will notice that in the choice of its themes for consideration and discussion this year's conference is breaking new ground. Its main theme is 'Christianity and the Religious Crisis.' This title strikes a note of alarm. This age is almost as full of crises as it is of problems, but somehow we seem to survive them and even to thrive on them. Christianity in the course of its history has passed through many crises and will, we must hope, pass safely through the present crisis. Dean Rashdall remarked in connection with George Tyrrell's volume, *Christianity at the Cross Roads* : we do well to remember that Christianity has often been at the cross roads before.

It is, however, when we come to examine the subjects treated under the general title that we observe something of significance. After the opening address the first paper deals with 'Christianity and Civilization.' This will be read by the Rev. Roger Lloyd, author of a number of interesting volumes, including *Christianity, History and Civilization*; a remarkable production for a hard-worked parish priest in industrial Lancashire.

The next paper, 'The Church and the New Science and the New Philosophy,' is contributed by the well-known Cambridge philosopher, Dr. Tennant, to whose many volumes in the sphere of philosophical theology English theological students owe much.

The third paper deals with 'The Church and Modern Historical Research and Biblical Criticism' and will be read by Professor Hooke of London University, whose work in the sphere of Biblical studies and early Christian origins is well known.

So far, the papers named deal with themes which have been treated at former Conferences, although we hope on this occasion that they will be treated in a new way—*non nova sed nove*. The bulk of the papers that follow, however, deal with themes which, so far as Modern Churchmen's Conferences are concerned, are new.

The first of these is by Canon Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Rector of Birmingham, and is entitled 'The Church and the Economic and Political Situation.' This should serve as a general introduction to what follows.

The next paper is by the well-known playwright and publicist St. John Ervine, who will deal with 'The Church and the New Morality.' There is nothing more essential in treating morals than a gift of humour, and Mr. St. John Ervine's reputation for wit, if not guaranteed by the fact that he is a member of the Irish Academy, is sufficiently justified by the wide popularity of his plays and novels.

The third paper, 'The Flight from Reason,' by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, needs no commendation. The theme lends itself as much to Mr. Hardwick's sardonic humour as the New Morality does to Mr. St. John Ervine's Hibernian wit.

The next three papers, 'Christianity and Communism,' 'Christianity and Fascism,' and 'Christianity and the English Democratic Movement,' may possibly alarm some of our older Conference members who feel that religion gains nothing by being associated with economics and politics, although economics and politics might gain much by being associated with religion; and that in any case, our Modern Churchmen's Confer-

ences being essentially religious gatherings, such papers as these ought to have no place in the Conference programme. The plea of the Conference authorities is: *autres temps autres moeurs*. The times have changed, and we who are Modernists must do well to take account of that fact. We do not wish to see our Modernist fellowship rudely plunged into violent political controversy and separated sharply into contending factions. The time has come when the true relations of the Christian religion to political policies, which are attracting and distracting mankind and have a most important bearing on the future of Christianity itself, need to be faced fearlessly and discussed dispassionately.

The paper on 'Christianity and Communism' will be delivered by the well-known writer on the relations of Christianity to Communism, Dr. Joseph Needham, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

The subject of 'Christianity and Fascism' will be treated by Sir Arnold Wilson, M.P., Editor of the *Nineteenth Century*.

The paper on 'Christianity and the English Democratic Movement' will be contributed by the Rev. H. G. Mulliner, who after a period of war service received his intellectual training in the School of Modern History at Oxford, where he obtained a First Class. He has recently become known to the public by his admirable life of Arthur Burroughs, Bishop of Ripon, whose domestic chaplain he was during the period of his episcopate.

The Conference next passes from the core of contention to the rind of the familiar. Leaving behind the consideration of the main factors in our present religious crisis, it proceeds to consider various contemporary methods of meeting that crisis. These are the 'Fundamentalist Solution,' the 'Romanist Solution' and the 'Humanist Solution.' The first of these papers will be by Dr. L. E. Browne, well known for his educational work in India and for his exposition of the Bible in the light of modern research. The second paper will be read by the Rev. A. R. Vidler of the Oratory House, Cambridge, whose published studies in modern Catholicism have been widely influential. Mr. Vidler is a Churchman of the Liberal Catholic School. The third paper will be given by the Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, whose papers delivered to former Modern Churchmen's Conferences have been highly valued.

The two concluding Conference papers deal with themes of more general interest. The first, entitled 'Christianity inside and outside the Churches,' will be read by Mr. Claud Mullins, the Metropolitan magistrate, whose practical work as a social reformer is widely known.

The last of the Conference papers is concerned with the 'Opportunity and Mission of the Church of England,' and will be contributed by the Rev. L. B. Cross, Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall.

Those who listen to these papers, and not least to the discussions which follow them, should have gained something which will assist in the better understanding of our present religious situation. This should be of no little help to our younger clergy, especially to those in busy parishes who have little time for study or even for thought. The inside of a week of their well-earned annual holiday spent in this way might prove in the truest sense of the word recreative. Up to the present—and it is a matter of some significance—the laity have exceeded the number of the clergy at these conferences.

THE EFFECT OF DISESTABLISHMENT IN WALES.

English Churchmen, in view of the existing agitation in favour of Disestablishment in this country, cannot fail to be interested in the present state of the Church in Wales. That Church was disestablished and to some extent disendowed—although in a very liberal manner—in the year 1914-20. As a consequence, a sufficient period has elapsed to provide evidence as to the general effect of the separation of Church and State in Wales. The collection and assessment of this evidence is, however, far from easy. A widely-supported view appears to be that on the material side the Church of Wales has benefited. Its material possessions, though somewhat less than before disestablishment, are better managed and utilized than was formerly the case. Many laymen have been drawn into the active service of the Church by their interest in its business management and by the increased power which the laity have secured under the new constitution. The general trend of the Church has been towards Catholicism. It is certainly more Anglo-Catholic in its ritual and doctrine than was formerly the case.

The Welsh Anglo-Catholics, active, astute, well-organized and self-sacrificing, have obtained control of the ecclesiastical machinery and are using their control in an enlightened and reasonable manner.

Evangelicalism, should a periodic Welsh Revival on a large scale occur in the near future, might once again become a power in the life of the Welsh Church, but unless this occurs, and it is not very likely that it will, Evangelicalism is bound to disappear or to find its last refuge in the Welsh Free Church Communions. Whatever are the virtues of the Anglican disestablished Churches it would appear that comprehensiveness, if it be a virtue, is not one of them.

Comprehensiveness is a gift granted to English Churchmanship by Establishment. Where Establishment is withdrawn the local Anglican communion loses breadth and variety of churchmanship and takes on a drab uniformity, be it evangelical or catholic. Another effect of disestablishment is observed in the falling off in the quality of the clergy: they cease to be public personages, and become merely ecclesiastical functionaries. It is possible that as a consequence they exercise a more intense influence within their religious communion, but they exercise very little influence at all outside it. This leads to a narrower type of man offering himself for ordination. As a consequence the influence of the Christian Church becomes less widely diffused and effective in the country at large, although the Church itself probably becomes a more ideal spiritual home for devout souls. The advantages and disadvantages of such results would be very variously assessed by different types of English Churchmen; nevertheless they ought to be seriously weighed by all who would take long, wide, and deep views—which are the only views worth possessing and propagating. The real question being: Is the Church to minister to the few at the expense of the many or to minister to the many at the expense of the few? Members of a National Church will favour the latter policy.

The *Western Mail* in its issues of February 11th and 12th, 1937, published two able articles contributed by the Rev. E. E. Thomas, D.Litt., Rector of Marchwiel, on the effects of Disestablishment in Wales. Dr. Thomas' conclusions as to the many-sided material benefits which the Welsh Church has de-

rived from Disetablishment are in general agreement with those expressed in this article, but he stands in grave doubt as to the stability of that Church's catholicism. The disestablished Welsh Church, although episcopally governed is essentially democratic in its constitution — its governing bodies are all elected. In the last resort the Church of Wales is governed from *below*, but according to Dr. Thomas the catholic principle of government is government from *above* — the hierarchy may delegate its powers to the lower ranks of the clergy or even to the laity, but the fount of authority is the Episcopate. Under the Welsh Church constitution, whilst it is within the power of the Welsh episcopate to check all progress in the way of doctrinal reform and development of Church worship, it has no power to make changes against the will of the majority either of the priesthood or of the laity. This situation is not Gilbertian, but typically English, although it occurs in Wales. The English policy is to give no one sole power to advance, but only sole power to stand still. If there is to be advance there must be a very large body of agreement in the community which would go forward. This certainly protects the community against costly experiments; but it is bound to make progress much slower than ardent souls desire. Dr. Thomas fears that in the Welsh Church of the future some great conflict may occur between catholic authority, as he understands it, and the forces of democratic progress; for Welsh Church democracy, so he believes, is on the side of progress, though not progress of a very lofty kind. He writes most interestingly of the future as he visualizes it.

> If the Church in Wales is not Catholic, what then is it? It is usual to oppose Protestantism to Catholicism, but this opposition does not hold in the Church of Wales at the present time, and I do not think it will ever appear again. The issue between these two forms of faith and worship is dead. It seems to me that the struggle of the future lies between those, on the one hand, who ask that the Church shall adopt and incorporate into its faith and doctrine the larger and newer principles which society itself is creating and bringing to expression, and which are directed towards the realisation of what the modern world considers to be good; and those, on the other hand, who believe that society must accept the principles laid down in the beginning by the Church and emanating from a source lying beyond society.
>
> This opposition has not yet manifested itself in the Church of Wales, but it is latent there. The new Constitution relates the Church to secular life in many ways and gives to that life an exceedingly large measure of control over Church affairs. It is inevitable that sooner or

later that power of control will be exercised, not only in reference to the material side of Church life but also in reference to the spiritual side. The secular forces and powers will not allow the ideals, aspirations, and hopes which they have created and cherish to be regarded as unspiritual and devoid of religious content and character.

At the moment the Church in Wales is not aware of the latent possibilities of a struggle lying in the new relationship to life which its Constitution has imposed upon it. When the moment of realisation does come the strength of the secular forces which the Church is now absorbing so rapidly into itself, the point of view of the laity to which it is paying increasing deference, and the character of its Constitution will, I feel sure, force the issue not in favour of Catholicism but against it.

We doubt whether he is right. Democracy in the Welsh Church is after all of a very restricted kind, and surely it was of a host of laymen faced by the opposition of a strong bishop that the Hebrew prophet wrote :

'A thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one' (*Isa.* xxx, 17).

Church Support for Mr. Herbert's Bill.

We republish with appreciation the following letter which appeared in the *Times* of February 24, 1937. It marks the triumph of Christian Liberalism in a long-drawn struggle within the Church of England. Let us hope that it is an augury of a better age in the relations of Church and State in this country.

Sir,—In June, 1931, we became members of a Joint Committee of the Convocations of Canterbury and York appointed to consider a resolution of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, dealing with marriage and divorce. We attended regularly the meetings of the Joint Committee and heard much evidence concerning various aspects of the inquiry. Finally in March, 1935, we signed a minority report. We could not agree with the majority in their contention that Christ in His teaching laid down a law of marriage. In our opinion He stated His ideal of indissoluble marriage; but, as in other teaching, He left His followers freedom in legislation. A Christian society can, rightly though reluctantly, permit the dissolution of marriages which owing to the actions of one of the partners have lost their sanctity. We believe that our view is supported by a majority of New Testament scholars of great eminence. It is incorporated in the custom or opinion of the Eastern and of most Protestant Churches.

With due regard to what we believe to be the mind of Christ, and in the light of the knowledge which we gained as members of the Convocation Committee, we have studied the Marriage Bill recently amended by a Standing Committee of the House of Commons, and we desire to commend this Bill to the Christian public of England.

All Christian people must have been shocked by the levity with which in recent years young persons have entered upon marriage only a few months before a petition for divorce has been presented. The

Bill proposes that before such a petition is possible five years must elapse from the date of the marriage. In that time the irritations which may arise in the first few months of marriage may be forgotten; children may come; mutual respect may grow strong.

As all know, an Act of 1923 allowed a wife, without proving cruelty, to obtain a divorce from a husband guilty of adultery. From that Act, passed without a thought of what might follow, the present scandal of collusive divorce, after possibly fictitious adultery, has arisen. The Marriage Bill proposes that the Court must be satisfied on the evidence that the case for the petition has been proved and that there has been neither condonation nor collusion. We have not sufficient knowledge of legal procedure to prophesy how the new proposals will work; but we understand that lawyers of eminence, experienced in divorce work, believe that the present scandal can by the proposals be ended.

No Christian could possibly desire any increase in the number of divorces. But when a marriage has in effect ceased to exist because of either desertion for three years, or cruelty, or insanity still incurable after a five-year confinement, we think that if the aggrieved partner so wishes it may be dissolved. The Bill proposes such grounds for divorce. It should be noticed that habitual drunkenness and imprisonment under a commuted death sentence will not become valid causes for divorce.

All social workers know that the separation orders made by courts of summary jurisdiction lead to many irregular unions. We approve the proposal that if such an order has been in force for three years the person who obtained the order may get a divorce.

At times the refusal of a party who has obtained a decree *nisi* to apply for a decree absolute is used as an opportunity for what a layman would call blackmail. We welcome the clause which will end this abuse.

The grounds on which under the Bill a marriage shall be voidable were unanimously approved by the Joint Committee of the Convocations. All its members would in fact go further than the proposed Bill and allow a decree of nullity when one party to a marriage knew of and concealed 'some notable hereditary mental or physical disorder.' If, for instance, a woman knows that she may carry haemophilia ('bleeding') and conceals the fact from the man she marries, he ought to be able to make a fresh marriage the children of which will not be tainted. Perhaps such legislation is for the future.

We very much wish that the Bill had retained its conciliation proposals. We recognize, however, that machinery for conciliation, alike in the High Court and in courts of summary jurisdiction, must be the outcome of patient experience. Its necessity will, we are convinced, in due course lead to its introduction in connexion with High Court cases.

Finally we would draw the attention of the clergy to the clause which relieves an incumbent of any obligation to solemnize the marriage of one whose former marriage has been dissolved and whose former partner is still living. Many clergy think that the genuinely innocent partner to a divorce may rightly, if a second union takes place, be married in church. The clergy remain free to solemnize such marriages, but cannot be compelled either to solemnize them themselves or to permit them to be solemnized in their churches by some other minister of the Church of England.

We cannot, of course, commit ourselves to approval of technicalities in the Bill; these call for a lawyer's knowledge and judgment. But we have tried to show that its principles are sound, and we hope that Christian people will demand its speedy passage into law.

Yours faithfully,

E. W. BIRMINGHAM.
R. WATERFIELD, Dean of Hereford.
T. GUY ROGERS, Rector of Birmingham.

The Bishop of Birmingham is as devoted as are the Bishops of St. Albans and Ely to the Christian ideal of marriage as a monogamus life-long union. Where these Bishops differ is not in their witness to this ideal and in their resolution to maintain it. Their difference arises over the right way of maintaining this ideal. The Bishops of St. Albans and Ely desire to enforce it legally and would support their action by excommunicating the law-breakers. The Bishop of Birmingham is opposed to legalistic methods and advocates those which are more reasonable and more humane and which would seem to be more in harmony with Christ's treatment of the weak and erring.

THE COMMENTS OF CROCKFORD.

The sixty-sixth volume of *Crockford's Clerical Directory*[1] —'A statistical book of reference for facts relating to the clergy and the Church'—has a value which extends beyond its 2,052 closely-printed pages of accurate and excellently arranged statistical data dealing with the Anglican Communion, at home and abroad. Statistics, especially in this scientific age, have immense value and interest; but books of statistics, like Tables of Logarithms, lack personality. Crockford, however, possesses personality. This it derives from the lively, vigorous Preface contributed by the Editor. This Preface summarizes the chief events of last year which concern the Church of England, and comments on them with much shrewd sense. There is a Johnsonian quality in the Editor's criticisms. Undoubtedly he is as profoundly devoted to the Church of England as was the great Doctor himself, and like the Doctor his loyalty is without emotionalism and cant. He holds the balance justly between Church and State, clergy and laity, the present and the past. He has a useful memory for facts which the framers of popular Church

[1] *Crockford's Clerical Directory for* 1937, published by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press (1937). Price 42/- and 63/-.

policies would gladly have forgotten. His judgment on the Tithe Act of 1936 is not cheering reading. He does not find that Act just and he doubts whether it is final. He opines that it may be used in the future as a proof that the State has endowed the Church instead of having deprived it of its property and paid it in return only four-fifths of its actual value. He criticizes the methods of the Clergy Pension Scheme, but applauds the action of the House of Laity for the part it took in increasing the humanity of the Pension Scheme provisions. He commends also the valuable but too often insufficiently appreciated work of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners who during the last century have increased the annual value of over 9,000 benefices by nearly £200 apiece.

Crockford's comments on the Report of the Archbishops' Commission dealing with the relations of Church and State and the discussion of them in Convocation, deserve very serious consideration. He caustically notes that in the Church Assembly debate on the Report

> 'the only kind of freedom with which the speakers appeared to be concerned was legislative and administrative. Not a word was said of the freedom which our present bondage secures to the clergy to pursue their studies and state their conclusions, and to take, if need arise, the unpopular side of some controversial question, religious, social, ethical, economic, or political. We think that both these privileges are of real value to religion, and that the Church would be ill-advised to jeopardise them in the hope of laying hands on the crock of gold which is to be found where the rainbow ends. We strongly suspect that had the Church possessed in the last century the freedom which is now desiderated the ministerial career of Frederick Temple would have been ended by *Essays and Reviews* and that of Charles Gore by *Lux Mundi*.'

In passing to the consideration of the possible effects of Disestablishment so ardently desired not only by a growing body of the Anglo-Catholic clergy but also by Free Churchmen, Roman Catholics and Secularists in this country, Crockford points out that (1) 'disestablishment would involve a complete degradation of the idea of the State, and outside our own country would be understood to mean, whatever we might say to the contrary, that England had repudiated the Christian religion.'

(2) 'If disestablishment were granted it would mean the substitution of inelastic trust-deeds for the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. Recent events in South Africa have shown to what formidable difficulties (soluble only by recourse

to the civil courts) the trust-deeds of a disestablished Church may give rise.'

(3) Crockford does not feel assured that 'the arrangements recently made by the Established Church of Scotland are relevant. The traditions and atmosphere of the Churches of England and Scotland differ very widely, as a brief comparison of the speeches made in the General Assembly with those made in the Houses of Convocation will show. Besides, the 'Scottish Solution' is only a few years old. Its merits will not be tested until some dispute involving property has arisen within the Church.'

(4) Crockford is not clear as to how our Church courts can be effectively reformed, but opines 'that a perfect Court of Justice is unattainable until we have arrived at a perfect state of society in which it will have no functions to discharge. We suspect that some of those who are most strongly opposed to our present arrangements would find equally cogent reasons for "depraving" any court, however constituted, which presumed to decide that they were wrong.'

(5) As for the 'spiritual freedom' of the Church, so vigorously demanded by those who identify spiritual freedom with ecclesiastical independence, Crockford points out that freedom from the State can only be secured by the Church if the Church is prepared to deprive herself of all material possessions—a hard saying, but one to be faced.

> 'We believe the outstanding fact to be that the Church of England is too large and too important for Parliament to be willing to leave it entirely alone. Indeed, no society of any kind which holds property in trust for any purpose can claim complete independence. If it wants to vary its functions, or the method in which it discharges them, to any considerable extent, it will have to get the consent of the State before it can use its property for what may be regarded as a different purpose. The State is no more infallible than it is omnipotent, and it may sometimes consent when it ought to have refused, or refuse when it ought to have consented. But the only way in which State interference can be avoided altogether is to hold no property; or to be ready to abandon it all at a moment's notice. Neither course is really practicable for a Church. If a Church could avoid all internal dissensions, then of course the risk of unreasonable or illegitimate State interference would be reduced to a *minimum*.
>
> The necessity of getting the consent of the State to important changes has nothing to do with Establishment, or even with the Christian religion.'

THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS AS A LAYMAN SEES IT

A CAMBRIDGE professor stated in a recent letter to the *Times* that 'the interest of the younger generation in historical Christianity is rapidly diminishing. The Churches are largely carried on by middle-aged people.' This grave statement leaves space presumably for some present-day movements which are characterized by lively personal experience. But these movements appeal mainly to the less critical, and there is an immense tract of young life which will remain outside Churches until convinced that the Churches rest on a faith which can be held and professed without compromising absolute honesty or abandoning freedom of thought.

Some of these non-conformers are wistful, even regretful. Others, a vast number, are accepting with diminishing concern their position as 'outsiders.' And yet the truth is that outside is not their proper place. They are there not by the will of the Founder and Leader of Christianity, but by the 'tradition of men.' The tragedy is not made less grim by the fact that among the upholders of the tradition there is widespread uneasiness. It is unwholesome (it is far worse than that) when official exponents of a confession hold it with provisos and interpretations which they are not permitted to express in public.

We wish then to plead for a new attitude of the Church mind toward religion, for an end to the frowning upon free thought, to the insistence upon ancient creed and dogma, and to the claim for final authority apart from reason and experience.

The old attitude is going to result very soon in religion being largely left to the Roman Catholics and to the cranks, that is, to those who may not think independently and to those who magnify some particular segment of the circle of Truth. Those of us who see in Christ the hope of the world cannot keep silence when we see Him being left there. For one thing, there are — frankly let us face it — many of us who have never quite fearlessly and freely reached a religious position of our own that

satisfies us, demands no suppression of our reason, will bear thinking about and can be shared with others without apology or misgiving. We have been a long way off that. In childhood we picked up the idea that there was a mischievous thing, nay often culpable, called 'doubt.' Once let that bogey sit and look at you, and the free action of your God-given mind is hampered and twisted.

Then there is the present-day loss to religion of men wholesale, diminishing congregations and the standing off from association with even the name of Jesus of the young people already referred to. And there is the whole world of men, near to perishing for want of the acceptance of all that He stood for, and stands for now when we will allow Him.

Most of our difficulties arise out of the traditional view of the Bible in which we have been brought up. Organized Christianity has tended to insist on infallible authority being represented either on the one hand by the Church or on the other by the Bible. Of these alternatives the one which it has fallen to Protestantism to uphold is belief in the written word. We need not be concerned to deny that during nineteen centuries innumerable lives have found inspiration in a reading of Scripture which has rested on such unquestioning belief. We gladly recognize that in the faithful use of the light which they possessed they have found freedom, happiness and creative energy. But we live in days when scholarship has cast a flood of fresh light on the circumstances of the writing of the books of the Bible, on the probabilities of authorship, the history of editing and the contemporary influences and considerations to which the writers were subjected. All of which means that we simply cannot regard the Bible as a collection of inerrant teachings and narratives nor as a mine for the quarrying of 'proof texts.' We are called, if we would be true, to take our courage in both hands (it may mean that for some) and recognize that even the records most sacred, and rightly sacred, are the product of verbal tradition, pious embellishment and standards of literary accuracy so different from our own as to be almost nonexistent. We may usefully take into consideration a fact to which many generations of Christians have been curiously blind. The Scriptures themselves lay no claim to infallibility. The most

assiduous digger of 'texts' is hard put to it to find any such claim. The growth of the canon of Scripture took place under the hands of men no more devout, and less qualified, than corresponding people of our own day and country. A canon compiled to-day would be a very different product.

The reaction of many good people to this sort of reflection is in effect, 'We don't really care very much, at any rate not vitally, what becomes of the six days of creation, Elisha and the axe-head, and so forth, but leave us our New Testament.' Or even (their next line of defence), 'We are prepared to admit that St. Paul was arbitrary about Church regulations, but leave us the four Gospels.' And our answer, not at all unsympathetic or irreverent, is that the Gospels matter more than all, for unless we admit that we see in a mirror darkly and are prepared to seek, even to grope, for the plain truth, we shall be in danger of perverting what vision and understanding are open to us of the loveliest life and influence that ever flowered in our human clay.

When we thus surrender to truth we may look for freedom and progress. It is in any case an obvious duty if we are to preserve our integrity of mind. And another thought may well influence us. It has been too often and intimidatingly assumed that we deny our Lord His rightful position if we seek Him through rational channels and find Him someone other than the miraculously-made wonder-worker of orthodox belief, now throned in heaven till He shall descend with the sound of a trumpet. Is it fantastic or unfair to ask what He Himself, in the light of history and of to-day, would have said to these conceptions which, literally accepted, remove Him hopelessly from the common humanity that He loved with such understanding and humour, the while He was tempted in all points like as we are? If our human minds, with all their limitations, are to run the risk, as they must, of misrepresenting Him, which risk is the greater, which misrepresentation the more disastrous? Many of us believe that Jesus can save the situation, for individuals and for the world, if He is given the chance. How can He have the chance unless men (unless we) are prepared to seek Him and listen to Him and then to follow Him? To do that we must peer into the 'dark glass' till we see Him as well as human eyes

can see Him. What He looked like to Paul, whose glass was Pharisee tint, to Francis who had a lovely medieval glass, to Wesley whose mirror was Moravian with an Oxford polish — all this is immensely interesting but not what really matters to us. Our vision is conditioned by a modern medium, probably the best made so far, and we must trust our own eyes and use them.

There are indications to show that apart from the peculiar dogmas and claims of organized and orthodox Christianity the human race may be won to a recognition of Jesus as *the supreme revealer of the secret of living*, whose attitude and spirit, adopted fearlessly by all men, would bring in the 'Kingdom of Heaven.' We cannot believe that the crime that ended His earthly life was in line with the will of God. And yet the Cross, voluntarily faced by Him, has proved to be the most moving appeal ever made to our noblest instincts, the crowning expression of the Love of God leading us to shame and penitence. We are moved to ask, with Paul, 'What shall I do, Lord?' Can we doubt that His answer, accepted by each one, would dispel the gloom of our social relations and the cloud of fear that hangs over mankind? Whatever the historical facts of His person, life and outlook, we cannot but feel the marvel of the divine seed that He planted and of its growth in men's hearts as its natural soil. It was a call to trust in a 'Heavenly Father' and to simple love and service. If His intention was in the least to lead men to a system of elaborate belief and ecclesiastical forms, we can only wonder that He was so silent as to these aims.

As men have conquered matter they have gone down deeper into disillusionment and fear. The traditions of religion and of politics come increasingly under suspicion — must we not say deservedly under suspicion? We are indeed in grave danger of making mischief between mankind and the Master by the barriers we set up and by our wrong-headed classifyings of 'outsiders' and 'insiders.'

The tasks of restatement and readjustment to which we are thus called are urgent. But if we are asked forthwith to indicate the precise steps, in doctrinal statement, Church order and the like, we frankly cannot here and now. The individual man or woman will, with care and a humble spirit, take the course that to each may approve itself as the 'will of God.' For

great institutions the whole position is more intricate, the road less easily surveyed, with difficulties from the multitude of counsellors and opinions. That in both cases the procedure must be drastic and entail much mental strife and pain none can doubt.

The inertia of the established order of things holds us back; it pulls tremendously. We are tempted to leave the task to somebody else. When one is familiar with the dear old paths the call to venture into new country is unwelcome, perhaps terrifying. But our natural shrinking must not be allowed to betray us into closing our eyes to facts. 'The interest of the younger generation in historical Christianity is rapidly diminishing.' And yet they care so keenly for the things that He cared about! Are we ready to meet them without perpetuating obstacles that every hour become more indefensible?

By way of a start, some such statement as the following may perhaps be offered.

A 'Creed' and a Challenge.

Believing in Jesus Christ as the hope of the world, we offer some considerations to those who would seek Him. The quest has been hindered by obstacles of superstition and tradition and the claims of authority. These are stumbling blocks to many.

Our Creed, then, begins at home, with myself and my neighbour. We believe in the Human Race, of which each of us forms a part. Man alone, within our experience, can and does contemplate the universe as something to be discovered, understood, mastered and controlled. He alone apprehends values superior to his immediate interests and inclinations. Since thus eternity is set in his heart we believe in the incalculable value of man.

A story of the development of man's thought and idealism is found in the Bible. We believe in the Bible for the vision which it gives us of the personality, teaching and work of Jesus and of the experience of God by man in many ages, from times of crude and primitive belief, the religious childhood of the race. The Bible is not, and does not claim to be, an infallible authority nor a series of oracles. It contains, readily accessible, spiritual treasure for all sorts and conditions of men. At the same time it calls for sincere literary and historical research and for exposi-

tion in the light of growing knowledge. We are each responsible, according to our ability, for reading and applying the Bible with the best help we are capable of using.

Experience shows that for humanity, individually and collectively, many ways are open. There are roads which lead to Life and roads to Destruction. Our supreme need is guidance. We believe the way is found in the teaching of Jesus, exemplified and enforced by His life. It is a true intuition, though expressed often with many errors, that He held the secret of life for individuals and for the race.

'Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto' us, realized the value of man and conceived the infinite power in human affairs of unselfish love. He postulated the Unseen Power, which man has guessed at through the ages, as a Father of Love, and men as sons of such a Father, called to carry His love into all the relationships of the human family. Completely dedicating His own life to this proposition, He asked men to make it come true in theirs also by faith and action, that is, by staking everything upon it, and He assured them that the experiment would justify itself. He sealed His teaching by His life and by His voluntary sacrifice in meeting hatred and murder. And according to the conviction of those who loved Him best He triumphed over death. Men discovered that the value and power of His way of life were not then lost, but intensified. The discovery was, like all discoveries of truth, a revelation of God. The intensity and efficacy of the experience they now reached was such that the person by whom it had come was recognized as 'divine.' 'God hath made,' they said, 'that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.'

This attitude towards Jesus, which regards Him as 'the Way, the Truth and the Life,' has resulted, in human experience under the most varied conditions, in the achievement of self-conquest, peace and joy. It has been maintained (perhaps oftener than not) in association with ideas that have been proved irrational and untrue, to justify which His own words have sometimes been cited. But, through all, this conception of Jesus Christ as incarnating the absolute values of Truth, Beauty and Goodness, which represent our purest ideas of Divine Character, has held men's

hearts, transformed their lives and inspired them to noble ends.

We are spectators and participants of the struggling progress of humanity from beginnings void and without form. Man is still subject to pain and liable to disaster. We must assume that it is consistent with Divine Love (working in regions and in dimensions not apprehended at present by our reason) that man should in these austere schools learn the uses of Love, Wisdom and Courage. Conspicuously and supremely Divine Love embodied in Jesus achieved a conquest to which we are all called. Of that love and conquest His Cross is the symbol. It is the badge, the consolation and the hope of all who humbly seek to share in His work. In the strife against ignorance, sin and suffering He stands as the instrument — the interpreter into human terms — of the universal principle of Love, the 'Heavenly Father' with whom He communed and whom He set forth before men. Through mysterious channels, and through us, He enters human life.

Since Christ has now no bodily powers through which to work, save ours, we are called to be 'His Body,' to carry on His conquests in His way. That is His call, which we are free to accept or to refuse.

We can respond to this call, as some have done, outside all Churches. But in our day the Christian Church is (with all its limitations) the rallying-point for fellowship and world-wide effort of those who would carry on His work. Even when all allowances have been made on the other side, its work for the overcoming of evil with good stands written in history. In these times the historic witness of our Churches and Christian Societies has a claim on us strong enough to transcend all difficulties and differences. It is still in association with them that we can best express, in the midst of forces of selfishness and destruction, our belief in the God of Love, revealed in Christ as being at once the Father and the Home of the Spirit of Man.

J. H. Early.

RELIGION IN HUNGARY

By the Rev. C. H. D. Grimes, M.A., F.R.G.S., Chaplain of the British Legation, Vienna.

FROM time to time I have the privilege of visiting Budapest and holding services there for the English Community. I have on such occasions tried to find out something about the religious life of a country which is so popular with English people, but of whose religious condition few indeed can know anything at all. I should like to put in the forefront of my statement a remark made to me by a leading Protestant minister not given to exaggeration, and which will I am sure make very encouraging reading for English Church people.

> 'In the Protestant Church since about ten years ago a very intensive Home Mission work is going on, and consequently the whole life of the Church is showing signs of revival. The people take religion much more seriously than they used to do. The youth, the women, the men of the Church are organized into separate communities which have their special evangelizing influences.'

To those who love the chivalrous Hungarian people and who recognize the great material difficulties they have to contend against, this is good news indeed. Roughly speaking, the population of Hungary is a little more than $8\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and according to the last religious census, it is divided up as follows: Roman Catholics 65 per cent., Reformed 20 per cent., Lutheran 6 per cent., Jews 5 per cent., Greek Church 3 per cent. In addition, there are 13,000 Baptists who form a church recognized by the law, and a few hundred Methodists, and probably the same number of Christian Scientists. The Churches are represented in the Upper House of Parliament by their bishops and leaders. We believe that this is the only country in Western and Central Europe where this is the case. Thus the Roman Catholics have twenty representatives, the Reformed Church and the Lutherans four, and the Jews two.

Hungary is peculiar in this also, that it is the only country where the Reformed Church uses the title Bishop. This, however, is only a recent event. The duties of a Reformed Bishop are more limited than those of an English Bishop: he is still, as

Milton would say, the old superintendent with the name writ small.

Bishop Ravasz, the Reformed Bishop in Buda-Pest, has a great reputation as a speaker and is also recognized as a cultural leader, a man with considerable personality and much beloved.

The Regent of Hungary, Admiral Hoarthy, is a Calvinist, and so is the present Prime Minister, and so was the last, the well-known General Gombosh. Among other leading men who belong to this church are Count Stephen Bethlen, also a former Prime Minister; Count Paul Teleki, former Minister for Foreign Affairs; and Prof. Geog, representative of the Carnegie Trust Endowment in Hungary. While on the Roman Catholic side, Bishop Glatefelder and Count John Licky, leader of the Christian opposition party, and a former Minister of Education, are looked up to as leaders. In the University of Buda-Pest, however, I could hear of no lay professor who took any real lead in religious matters, and outside the politicians I have mentioned, no outstanding laymen in the country.

While I was there I met Dr. Buchman, who was interviewing several leading people who seemed to be sympathetic. Already the Oxford Groups have made a start with some success. A good deal is due to the efforts of Miss Bentinck, the sister of the late British Minister at Sofia, now in Chili. At a recent house party in Buda-Pest there were three hundred people present.

There are four universities in Hungary. The principal one at Buda-Pest has a faculty for Roman Catholic students only. In the other three, the Reformed Church has a theological faculty in one, the Lutherans in another, and the third is entirely secular. But as it is situated in a district which is entirely Roman Catholic, it is sympathetic to that Church.

Each Church has its seminaries for training its young men for the ministry. The Reformed Church has a very important college in Buda-Pest and three other colleges in the country. I understand that they have an ample supply of young men coming forward for the ministry. Of course in a country with so much unemployment every opening has plenty of applicants. In addition, the Reformed Church has one college of law, twenty-six High Schools for boys and girls, five Training Colleges for teachers, and about 1,170 elementary schools. We must, I think, consider this a very satisfactory educational record.

The Y.M.C.A. is quite a strong organization here, and has been at work for the last fifty years. Its influence is chiefly among the industrial and commercial classes. There are also various youth organizations attached to the different churches, and a real effort is being made to get hold of the youth; and church attendance, as a consequence, is said to be improving. There are also student organizations to carry out evangelical work. The older one is the '*Pro Christo*' Association. It was founded about 1910 and has a close connection with the World Student Christian Movement. It has its own building in Buda-Pest, where its hostel is placed. There is a younger association known as the '*Soli Deo Gloria.*' This belongs exclusively to the Reformed Church. It works among the University students and the scholars of the high schools.

When I was last in Buda-Pest there was an International Council of Youth, sponsored by the Y.M.C.A.; and in the summer, an important international gathering took place at one of the Hungarian summer resorts, and I heard of another in the spring. The number of such international gatherings is likely to go on growing, especially as the Government is anxious to attract people to Hungary and to provide every facility for them. The effect of these international gatherings on the Church life of a country which has up to now been very much shut off from the rest of Europe can well be imagined.

The Roman Catholic Church in Hungary is very rich, at least when compared with the other churches. It possesses a great deal of landed property. It also receives State aid, as do all the other Churches in Hungary. Most of the aristocracy belong to this Church. But in the extreme east, in what is now left to Hungary of Transylvania, gentle and simple alike belong to the Reformed Church. Debreizen, the chief city in those parts, is called the Rome of Calvinism.

The Churches, other than the Roman, are poor, though some parishes give what is for a Hungarian a good salary. The majority of pastors are, I fear, very badly paid, and this must largely circumscribe their activity; though if in a poor district they were to get more it would probably only excite envy. Hungary, it must be remembered, is a very poor country. It ought not to be so, for the great fertile plains grow wheat in abundance, but un-

fortunately owing to the excessive duties charged at the frontiers it cannot export its produce except in small quantities. The price of wheat is so low that it is almost impossible for the country people to make a living. They have indeed plenty to eat, but little more, for they are paid necessarily a miserable wage. Hungary is one of the few countries in Europe where the great landowners still keep their large estates and still live in feudal style, but this does not tend to enrich the countryside.

To brighten the monotony of village life something has been done recently, chiefly by the youth of the towns, who have tried to arrange that every big village and group of small villages should have a village set who should be responsible for organizing the social life of the village and for co-operation with neighbouring villages. The Churches have also taken a hand in this, both the Roman and the Evangelical. They have organized separately, of course. They hold big meetings of people from the villages in Buda-Pest annually, where discussions are carried on as to how best to bring the village people to Christ. The Government has also collaborated by giving startling reductions in the railway fares for this purpose. The study of folk lore has also been encouraged in the villages, thereby engendering some pride in the village itself, and a scheme for the higher education of the villagers is on foot. If anyone had gone into the Hungarian villages as I have, and seen the almost impassable roads in winter—a sea of mud—he would understand the necessity of trying to help these poor people by bringing to them some of the culture of the great outside world. When everyone is scraping for a living there is nothing to spare for the extras of recreation and culture. The farmer and the shopkeeper have to be hard-hearted; and the young lawyer and doctor are only seeking an early opportunity to move into a town; whilst the priest or pastor is usually too poor to give much.

The State professes to be impartial in religious matters, and no doubt tries to be so. The very fact, however, that the leading men in the Government are Protestants makes them, in order to prove their impartiality—so I am told by Protestants—often lean rather to the other side than to their own, especially as the other side have the greater numbers—always an important fact with the politician. Whereas when a matter comes before a

smaller official, who will naturally, in a great many cases, be a Roman Catholic, he is usually not concerned to display impartiality: his Church does not teach this virtue.

There are a large number of Jews in Hungary—speaking relatively, that is to say, to other countries. They form five per cent. of the population. To hear some people talk you would think they formed at least fifty per cent. of the population. As the greater number live in Buda-Pest, every fifth man there is a Jew. They are unfortunately not more popular there than anywhere else. People remember that it was a Jew, Bela Kun, who headed the Communist revolt, which caused such terrible suffering and misery in Hungary so that the memory of it survives like a nightmare. Another and a stronger reason is that there, as elsewhere, the Jews have secured a commercial supremacy and own most of the leading enterprises—the industries, the banks, the newspapers, the publishing houses. Though there is a Jewish problem in Hungary, the attitude of the people towards them is usually friendly. Periodically, however, agitations against them break out, chiefly among the University students, who see their hopes of employment endangered by Jewish competition. The Government, however, strictly suppresses these outbreaks, whilst it limits the number of Jewish students at the Universities. The Government is also making it very hard for young Jews to obtain employment in banks and other commercial institutions, where there is at present a great excess of Jewish employees.

The Church of Scotland has a mission for Jews which it has maintained for a long time. It has a very good school for girls under fourteen, and it is largely attended. The head of the mission is satisfied that the girls in this school learn something of what a Christian atmosphere means, and many appreciate this very much.

As is well known, Hungary may be said to be the home of the gypsies. It certainly is of their music; but they are no more popular in their own home than elsewhere. Here, as elsewhere, they hang round the villages and have an evil reputation for stealing. Most of them still retain their traditional religion, but (and one cannot be surprised at this) it is not recognized officially, so they are told to put themselves down as Roman Catholics, even as in our country people of no religion count as C. of E. Little is done for them, but there is a society (*Bethania*),

an offspring of the Christian Endeavour Movement in Hungary, which occupies itself with these picturesque people.

The fact that Hungary has suffered so terribly from Communism in recent times means that to-day Communist doctrines make little headway. There, among the youth, Communism is not the danger to the Church that it is elsewhere, but it has adherents among the young Jews. But where there is much unemployment such as actually exists to-day in Hungary, there Communism is sure to raise its head. Unfortunately neither the Church nor the State can solve the Hungarian unemployment problem; it can only be done by agreement with Hungary's neighbours, and the difficulty here is almost insuperable. It is interesting to note that while in Austria Lutheranism is so very much stronger than Calvinism, in Hungary it is the reverse. The reason no doubt is, not what one pastor gave me, that the flat plains of Hungary inclined the mind more to the simpler doctrines of Calvinism; that is too ingenious, it is *ganz anders*. In Austria there are many men of North German stock, and this accounts for the preponderance of Lutherans there; in Hungary the Germans are few in numbers, and so Lutheranism is weak. Hungarian Calvinism owes its existence to one of the Princes of Transylvania, who introduced Calvinism into his country and thence it spread all over Hungary. To-day the Lutherans have their strength in the middle classes, and the Calvinists draw theirs from the country people. As in Austria, the differences between Calvinism and Lutheranism are largely matters of the past, but tradition and vested interests are too strong to allow these two churches to amalgamate and to present a united front to the modern world, to which many of the pastors seem strangers. Lutherans and Calvinists do work together to a certain extent in their relations with the Government. Modernism is non-existent to-day among the Hungarian Protestants.

My own impression corresponds with the optimistic statement I have made at the beginning of this article, that good and successful work is being done by the Church in Hungary, and one cannot but hope that it will bear much fruit among this high-spirited and talented people, who, although not without their faults, possess a most likeable and generous nature and to-day are making themselves so much better in many departments of life.

RUMANIAN RUMINATIONS AND RESOLVES

By the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

IN a leading article on January 23rd, 1937, *The Times* expressed the opinion that history may yet justify a sagacious bishop's remark to the effect that the events of Convocation on Wednesday, January 20th, were the most important since the Reformation. We agree, but with no enthusiasm; for the events referred to culminated in the passing of a resolution that the Report of the Conference at Bucarest between representatives of the Church of England and that of Rumania (called for short the Rumanian Report) is 'consonant with Anglican formularies and a legitimate interpretation of the Faith of the Church as held by the Anglican Communion'; and this Rumanian Report definitely and deliberately goes back upon the Reformation. Thus, the Church of England is not this time at one of the many cross-roads which must inevitably be negotiated by a Church that is on the march; she has, in her official ecclesiastical councils, attempted to go back upon the guiding principles that in the sixteenth century started her on her independent journey; and she has gone back upon them officially. The only palliating circumstance is that she has gone back upon them in a fog, a fog raised by English amiability and intellectual indifference. Few people have studied the Report itself, even among those who in one way or another have had to vote upon it. This is not so shocking as at first it seems, for the Report is wholly and intricately doctrinal, and most Englishmen would feel it to be the concern only of theologians. It has also been difficult to obtain, except direct from the Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly; for booksellers did not stock it, and the present writer found it impossible to obtain in any bookshop in Birmingham and Oxford without first putting it on order. For which reason, the terms of the Report will be printed in full in the course of this article.

However, those who have by their votes supported this Re-

port have done so chiefly on grounds independent of its contents. It has been urged upon them (A) that the Report represents a genuine effort after Christian unity; (B) that we ought to look at the question of Reunion from the Rumanian point of view as well as from our own; (C) that there are many practical reasons why the Report deserves approval. To these three points we shall now address ourselves, considering them in inverse order.

(C) *Practical reasons alleged for upholding the Report.*

These practical reasons, which have been urged in private conversations rather than in public debate, are chiefly the following:

(1) The Church of Rumania is faced with atheistic communism, which is capturing the younger generation. We must therefore help the Rumanian Church in its fight for Christianity.

(2) Rumania is in danger from Fascist Italy, whose influence is spreading strongly in South-Eastern Europe. Our support of the Church of Rumania will stem these dangerous political tendencies.

(3) The Rumanian Church is anxious to benefit by the treasures of Western knowledge and culture. Alliance with the Church of England would mean salvation from superstition.

(4) The Church of Rumania, which has at least eleven million members, is one of the most important of the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Alliance with it would thus strengthen the Church of England against the influence of the Church of Rome, which does not look with favour upon the present move.

(5) Acceptance of the Rumanian Report would show so conciliatory a spirit that it might persuade the opponents of reunion with the Free Churches to forbear from wrecking the South India scheme.

(6) Acceptance of the Report will end the Romeward movement in the Church of England, for Anglo-Catholics will be satisfied with the Catholicity of an English Church which has achieved Inter-communion with the Eastern Orthodox Church.

(7) If the Report is held to be doctrinally inconsistent with the position of the Church of England we shall have endeavoured to unchurch the largest party in the Church of England,

namely, the Anglo-Catholics. Such intolerance is unthinkable. Surely the Anglo-Catholics have at least a right to exist within our Church.

To these seven points we would make the following replies :

(1) The Church of England also is faced with atheistic communism. Is it therefore likely that a profession of doctrine wholly mediaeval in its outlook can stem this evil tide?

(2) Political considerations should not enter into Church alliances. Christian fellowship should presuppose Christian standards held in common by both sides, a condition fulfilled as between us and the Free Churches but not the Church of Rumania. The ill-treatment of Baptists in Rumania has already been a subject of painful correspondence in *The Times* since the Rumanian Report was framed, and the General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance complains that Baptist places of worship in Rumania are sometimes arbitrarily closed, their preachers silenced, and their worshippers beaten. Further, in connection with the recent assault by Rumanian students upon the Rector of the University of Jassy, one of whose ears was cut off by his assailants, it is to be noted that the Rumanian Cabinet has found it necessary among other things 'to approve the appeal by the Minister of Cults to the Patriarch asking him to punish the participation of clergy in campaigns of hate' (*The Times*, 3rd March, 1937). We ought to be chary of submitting our Christianity to a Church whose members participate in such crimes, By doing so, we have in fact become a pawn in the politics of the Rumanian Church, which, like all spiritually decadent Churches, seeks to aggrandise its power as an institution. The Church of Rumania aspires to the lordship (lost by Russia) over the Slav Orthodox Churches; and an alliance with the Church of England will enhance its claim. This is the real import of the invitation to the Church of England to take a hand in Rumanian politics. No Church which engages in political intrigue ever does so with impunity.

(3) The Reformed doctrine of the Church of England is indeed a power against superstition. But the Bucarest Report would undo the work of the Reformers. Nor can a mere alliance

with another Church save any body of worshippers from superstition: the teaching of their own authorities alone can help towards that end.

(4) and (5) Intrigue of this kind is not in accordance with the mind of Christ. Nor ought we to be willing to tamper with Truth in the supposed interests of reunion with any party.

(6) The Romeward movement in the Church of England is more likely to be strengthened than weakened by acceptance of the Report. One of our Romanizing clergy, in a recent pamphlet called 'The Peril of Isolation' (Council for Promoting Catholic Unity, Pilot Paper, No. 2), is plainly not so much impressed by the fact that the whole Eastern Orthodox Church has one hundred and fifty million members (at most) as by the fact that there are three hundred millions who adhere to Rome. What are eleven million Rumanian Churchmen to English Churchmen who believe that reunion with Rome is in sight? They will, of course, welcome our alliance with the Church of Rumania; but the latter is notoriously Romanist in its theology, and the alliance may be looked upon fairly as a step towards our own ultimate absorption by Rome. To regard the alliance as a strengthening of the Church of England (or of the Church of Rumania) against Rome is surely shortsighted, and in any case a dangerous game with fire.

(7) Certainly we would allow even extreme Anglo-Catholics a right to exist within the Church of England, but on grounds of Christian inclusiveness, not upon doctrinal grounds. That differing systems of theology have always existed within the Church of England is due only to the Reformers' sense that precision in doctrine is not the primary standard of Christian discipleship. Englishmen have been given the Prayer Book, and no one who would use it has been excluded from membership in the National Church. General agreement with the teaching and practice contained in the English Prayer Book should have constituted the basis for inter-communion with the Rumanian Church. There is even no reason why the English Prayer Book should not have been expounded to the Rumanian Church by Anglo-Catholic interpreters. It is, however, a grave new departure for the Church of England to have approved

officially, as consonant with her doctrine and formularies, any precise interpretation of them. Thereby the chief glory of the Church of England as a Church, her comprehensiveness, has been dealt a shattering blow.

(B) *The need of appreciating the Rumanian point of view.*

The point of this plea is to justify the doctrinal nature of the Report. It is claimed that the doctrinal way of approach is inevitable to the Rumanian mind, and that before the Rumanians can extend to us the right hand of Christian fellowship they must investigate Anglican theology in order to ascertain that it is not heretical. There are two answers to this seemingly fair point. First, that although it is alleged that the Rumanian Church is urgently in need of Anglican support, we ourselves have put no questions, but have instead become the suppliants. The Report is, in fact, no more than an investigation of the conformity of Anglican doctrine with that of an un-Reformed Church, to the end that the latter may pronounce our Orders valid. Secondly, and even more important, is the fact that so far back as 1922 the Patriarch and Holy Synod of another Orthodox Church — that of Constantinople — accepted the validity of Anglican Orders *without* any doctrinal report such as the Rumanian Report having either been appoved by the English Convocations or even been drawn up. Moreover, both the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus followed suit (Lambeth Report, 1930, p. 132). There should therefore be no need to secure dogmatic agreement as a preliminary to recognition of the Anglican Church by the Church of Rumania. That this should have been done is one more symptom of a growing tendency in the Church of England to identify religious unity with doctrinal uniformity.

(A) *The Report is a genuine effort after Christian unity.*

In what sense this is true is expressed above. We do not doubt that the representatives of the Church of England who have signed this Report, and the Anglo-Catholic party with whom they are identified, do indeed desire religious unity. But they regard it as a goal to be achieved only through identity of dogmatic belief and ecclesiastical order, instead of through common discipleship to Jesus Christ. Not even this Report

represents the *full* dogmatic agreement necessary to final Intercommunion between the Orthodox and the Anglican. To achieve that end the Report concludes that further conferences are desirable. We cannot doubt that this means that further concessions are required to un-Reformed doctrine; and a glance at the Report will prove this, for the method of the Conference was for the Anglican representatives finally to accept their statements *as amended by the Rumanians.*

At this point we print the findings of the Report, *verbatim.*

The Thirty-Nine Articles.

In answer to an enquiry of the Rumanian Commission the Anglican Delegation stated that:

> 'The Doctrine of the Anglican Church is authoritatively expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and that the meaning of the XXXIX Articles must be interpreted in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer' [See *Lambeth Conference* 1930, p. 139]

and that therefore the XXXIX Articles are to be regarded as a document secondary to the Book of Common Prayer.

The Holy Eucharist.

A statement was submitted by the Rumanian Commission to the Anglican Delegation, concerning the Holy Eucharist and was accepted unanimously by the latter in the following form:

1. At the Last Supper, our Lord Jesus Christ anticipated the sacrifice of His death by giving Himself to the Apostles in the form of bread blessed by Him as meat and in the form of wine blessed by Him as drink.

2. The sacrifice offered (προσενεχθεῖσα) by our Lord on Calvary was once for all, expiates the sins as well of the living as of the dead, and reconciles us with God. Our Lord Jesus Christ does not need to sacrifice Himself again.

3. The sacrifice on Calvary is perpetually presented in the Holy Eucharist in a bloodless fashion (ἀναιμάκτως) under the form (Rumanian, *sub chipul*) of bread and wine through the consecrating priest and through the work of the Holy Ghost in order that the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross may be partaken of by those who offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by those for whom it is offered, and by those who receive worthily the Body and Blood of the Lord.

4. In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration (μεταβολή) the Body and Blood of our Lord. How? This is a mystery.

5. The Eucharistic bread and wine remain the Body and Blood of our Lord as long as these Eucharistic elements exist.

6. Those who receive the Eucharistic bread and wine truly partake of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition.

The Conference considered the following statement agreed to unanimously at its session at Lambeth in 1931 by the Orthodox and Anglican members of the Joint Doctrinal Commission appointed in pursuance of the recommendation of the Orthodox Delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1930 and of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 [see *Lambeth Conference* 1930, Resolution 33 (*b*), p. 48].

'Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church.

'We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which came down from our Lord and the Apostles through the Fathers, which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

'We agree that nothing contained in Tradition is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be logically defined and distinguished, yet they cannot be separated from each other nor from the Church.'

The Rumanian Commission agreed unanimously that if the above statement is amended to read as follows, it will be sufficient :

'*The Revelation of God is transmitted through the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Tradition.** Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture, as completed, explained, interpreted and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church. We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which come down from our Lord and the Apostles and *have been defined by the Holy Councils or are taught by the Fathers,** which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

'We agree that nothing contained in Tradition is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be logically defined and distinguished, yet they cannot be separated from each other nor from the Church.'

The Anglican Delegation concurred unanimously with the Rumanian recommendation.

Divine Mysteries.

The Conference compared the two statements upon the Sacraments made respectively and unanimously by the Orthodox and Anglican members of the Joint Doctrinal Commission at its session of October 1931, namely :

(*a*) by the Orthodox :

'We accept that the two of the seven Sacraments—namely Baptism and the Holy Eucharist—the first as introducing us into the Church, the second as uniting us with Christ, are pre-eminent among the others. But we do not think that the other five are of secondary importance as Sacraments, neither that they are unnecessary to the spiritual life of the Christian and consequently to his salvation. These also, as the two first are Holy Services of Divine foundation in which through an outward visible sign the invisible grace of Christ is conveyed.'

* The words italicised constitute the amendments by addition or alteration.

(*b*) by the Anglicans :

'The number of the Sacraments has never been authoritatively fixed either by tradition from the Apostles or any decision of an Œcumenical Council. We recognise that the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist are pre-eminent above the rest. As regards other Sacraments, while the Eastern Orthodox Church uses the term *mysterion* also of Ordination, Penance, Confirmation or Chrism, Marriage, and the Anointing of the Sick; in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England the word Sacrament is only used of the two Sacraments Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, inasmuch as these only have an outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself and are held to be generally, that is universally, necessary for salvation. But it is recognised also in the Anglican Communion that in other Rites there is an outward and visible sign and an inward spiritual grace, and in that sense they may be considered to have the character of Sacraments and are commonly called Sacraments.'

While hesitating to revise the above Anglican statement and while considering that before a final and complete agreement is reached, a further Conference is desirable, the Anglican Delegation agreed unanimously to recommend for consideration the following formula :

'We agree that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, the first as introducing us into the Church, the second as uniting us with Christ and through Him with the Invisible Church, are pre-eminent among the Divine Mysteries. We agree that because Holy Scripture and Tradition witness to their origin, Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing, Holy Orders and the Unction of the Sick are also Mysteries in which, an outward visible sign being administered, an inward spiritual grace is received.'

The Rumanian Commission agreed to recommend this formula to the Holy Synod of Rumania for consideration.

Justification.

The Orthodox Commission and the Anglican Delegation agreed unanimously upon the following statement :

'By the redeeming action of our Lord Jesus Christ, mankind has become reconciled to God. Man partakes of the redeeming grace through faith and good works, and reaches through the working of the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, sanctification by means of the Church and the Holy Sacraments.'

The Validity of Anglican Orders.

The Rumanian Commission made the following Declaration :

'Having considered the conclusions of the papers on the Apostolic Succession, Holy Orders, Holy Eucharist, Holy Mysteries in general, and Tradition and Justification,

'And having considered the declarations of the Anglican Delegation on these questions, which declarations are in accordance with the Doctrine of the Orthodox Church,

'The Rumanian Orthodox Commission unanimously recommends the Holy Synod (of the Rumanian Orthodox Church) to recognise the validity of the Anglican Orders.'

The Anglican Delegation received the Declaration with due acknowledgment.

Conclusion.

In the strictest interpretation of the Rumanian invitation, the purpose of the Anglican Delegation was to elucidate the statements interchanged between the Orthodox Delegation of 1930 and the Anglican Bishops with whom it conferred, in order that the Rumanian Commission might be able to advise the Holy Synod of Rumania as to whether it should declare that subject to the agreement of all the sister Orthodox autokephalous Churches, it is prepared to accept Anglican Ordinations.

As the result of the Conference, the Rumanian Commission has decided unanimously to recommend the Rumanian Holy Synod to accept the validity of Anglican Orders.

It should be noted, further, that in the course of the Conference, important agreements were reached between the Rumanian Commission and the Anglican Delegation, not only

(*a*) upon the doctrine and significance of the Sacred Ministry, but also
(*b*) upon the doctrine and significance of the Holy Eucharist,
(*c*) upon the doctrine and significance of Holy Tradition, and
(*d*) upon Justification.

Moreover, a preliminary agreement was also reached upon the nature and character as Holy Mysteries of Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing and the Unction of the Sick.

By these agreements, we believe that a solid basis has been prepared for further discussions whereby full dogmatic agreement may be affirmed between the Orthodox and the Anglican Communions. And to that end, we are agreed that it is desirable that further Conferences should be held between representatives of the Church of Rumania and the Church of England, with or without assessors from the other Orthodox autokephalous Churches and from the other churches and provinces of the Anglican Communion.

But whether or not the agreements reached in this Conference upon the Holy Eucharist, upon Holy Tradition, upon the other Divine Mysteries and upon Justification be implemented in all their details, we are of opinion that by the decision of the Rumanian Commission in regard to the acceptance of Anglican Ordinations as valid from the Orthodox point of view, this Conference has prepared a solid foundation for dogmatic agreement between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches.

In saying this, however, we are well aware that this expectation is provisional, in the first instance upon the acceptance of the Rumanian Commission's recommendations by the Holy Synod of the Church of Rumania and ultimately of the other Orthodox autokephalous Churches which have not yet replied to the invitation issued in 1922 by the Œcumenical Patriarch.

Finally, the Church of England Delegation and its assessors desire to express their warm sense not only of the thoroughness of the investigation of the Rumanian Commission but also of its deep spiritual and Christian goodwill. And in so doing, they desire to acknowledge the singular and gracious kindness and brotherly hospitality accorded to them by His Beatitude the Patriarch of Rumania.

Space compels us to limit our observations on the above doctrinal statements. We would refer our readers to the Memorandum in respect of them issued by the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union and published in the *Modern Churchman* last month. But the following points may here be added :

With regard to the Thirty-nine Articles, these were written to safeguard Reformation doctrines and are therefore the proper authoritative statement of the sense in which the services of the Prayer Book should be interpreted in the Church of England. To say that the Articles are 'secondary to the Book of Common Prayer' is therefore unwarranted. They are, in fact, of primary importance for the understanding of the Prayer Book. It is also to be noted that, before the other doctrinal statements of this Report could be made, it was found necessary to discredit the Thirty-nine Articles—so clear are they in stating the main points in which the Reformed doctrine and practice of the Church of England stands distinguished from the un-Reformed doctrine and practice.

With regard to the statement concerning 'The Holy Eucharist,' we would draw attention to item (5), which clears the way entirely for Reservation and Adoration of the Elements; and to item (4), which, in stating 'that the Bread and Wine become by consecration the Body and Blood of Our Lord,' uses the word *metabole* = change. Metabolism is the science of chemical changes in organic bodies. After this, nothing is gained by stating that the method of change is a 'mystery'! An element of intellectual escape through ambiguity is added, and that is all.

With regard to the statement on 'Holy Scripture and Holy Tradition,' it is to be observed that the Anglican Prayer Book states that all things necessary for salvation are *contained* in Holy Scripture. The Report, however, states that 'the Revelation of God is *transmitted* through the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Tradition'; and 'Holy Scripture is only declared thus sufficient 'as *completed*, explained, etc., in Holy Tradition. Two points are to be noted in these statements; first, the placing of subsequent 'Holy Tradition' on a level with that of the Apostolic Age in which the New Testament Scriptures were written; secondly, the term 'transmitted,' or handed on, which, treating Divine Revelation as a deposit entrusted by God to the Church, implicitly denies the possibility of additions to it and variations from it. This view is indeed emphasized by the sections printed in italics, which were inserted by the Rumanian Commission but subscribed by the Anglican as well, and which state explicitly what the above formula implies,

i.e. that the Holy Tradition was closed with the General Councils and the Fathers. Both Commissions defined Holy Tradition as 'truths . . . confessed unanimously and continuously in the undivided Church.'

A careful examination of the Report shews that, point by point, the Rumanian and Anglican Commissions examined the doctrines which were in question at the Reformation, and stated the beliefs which they subscribed in terms of Tridentine Theology. But the Tridentine formularies were framed to combat the Reformed doctrine and practice, and these Tridentine affirmations are themselves deliberately confuted by the Thirty-nine Articles (published in their present form in 1571). The Council of Trent concluded in 1563. The acceptance of the Rumanian Report by Convocation is indeed a step towards Reunion, but to reunion between Churches which reject the Reformation; and it thus narrows the grounds on which general Christian Reunion might have been possible. All this lends an air of irony to the following statement in the leading article of *The Times* of Jan. 23rd to which we have referred: 'How notable a step towards Reunion was taken on Wednesday, when the Church of England finally approved the Rumanian Report, and the marked degree in which it is likely to aid future discussions, are facts as yet not generally understood.' When they *are* understood we think that the laity of the Church of England will shake themselves out of the indifference with which they have for the most part received the Report. Among other things we would draw their attention to the fact that in a resumé of discussions held between the Patriarch of Alexandria, etc., and Bishops of the Anglican Communion, at Lambeth Palace from July 15th to 18th, 1930, it is stated that 'in questions of Faith the authentic decision would be given in the Anglican Communion by the whole body of Bishops; without, however, excluding the co-operation of clergy and laity during the discussions' (Lambeth Report, 1930, p. 138). Thus it is claimed that the last word with regard to the doctrine of the Church of England lies with the Bishops; so that a unanimous vote by the Bishops in Convocation that the doctrine of the Rumanian Report is consonant with that of the Church of England is completely reassuring to the medievally-minded Church of Rumania. We believe that the Bishop of

Birmingham was the only bishop in Convocation who did not vote for the Report. Indeed, he moved an amendment, supported by the Bishop of Truro, to the effect 'that the House, having read the Report of the Conference, would cordially welcome Inter-communion with the Orthodox Church of Rumania'; and this amendment was supported by four Evangelical Bishops. When it was lost, we understand that these four Bishops voted for the motion that was finally passed. Had they voted against the Report, it could not have been represented to the Church of Rumania that the Bishops of the Church of England, 'who alone have the power to decide in questions of faith,' had decreed without contrary votes that this Report is consonant with Anglican doctrine. We wonder how many of our Evangelical friends are aware of the fact that in the 'Vindication of the Bull "Apostolicae Curae"; A letter on Anglican Orders by the Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster' (Longmans Green & Co., 1898), these Roman Catholic Prelates wrote:

> 'We may point out that in all which concerns the Real Objective Presence, the true Propitiatory Sacrifice, and the nature and extent of the Priesthood, the Church over which Leo XIII rules and the great Eastern or Russian Church hold identical doctrine. The object of Leo XIII in his Bull has really been to defend the doctrine held in common by East and West, and you cannot reject the doctrine of Leo XIII without at the same time rejecting that of the East. On this point it will be sufficient to refer you to the language of the Synod of Bethlehem.' (For which see Appendix 7 to the letter.)

Conclusion.

It is then plain that, whether the doctrines now described as 'consonant with Anglican Formularies, etc.,' are so, is not a matter for bargaining or for amiability, but a plain matter of Theology and History. It is only by cancelling the Reformation from the Church of England that this conclusion can be maintained. Thus the significance of the Report lies in its relation to the steady Romanizing movement in the Church of England. This will appear the clearer if the progress of that movement since the Lambeth Conference of 1920 be noted.

In 1921, 'Terms of Inter-Communion,' drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee, were published, but not officially communicated to the different provinces of the

Anglican Communion. In 1930 these terms of Communion were agreed by the Bishops at Lambeth to be '*not inconsistent* with the mind and the doctrine of the Anglican Church.'

At the Bucarest Conference of 1935 the doctrinal statements first made by the Anglican representatives were sometimes recognizable as Anglican; but they were then amended by the Rumanian Theologians as in a Tridentine direction. Thus the conclusion was finally reached that 'a solid basis has been prepared for *further discussions*, whereby *full* dogmatic agreement may be affirmed between the Orthodox and the Anglican Communions.'

Parallel with all this has been (1) the authorization by the Bishops, without any legal sanction, of the 'Deposited Book' in 1928; and (2) the growth of the Catholic Reunion Society in the Church of England, which was described by one of its members to a special correspondent of the *Tablet*, on October 24th, 1936, as consisting of 'exactly 1,016 clergymen who have these last eight years subscribed to the faith of the Council of Trent and pledged ourselves to preach it to our parishes. Moreover,' added the speaker, 'some 2,000 others are in sympathy with our aims, and join us every year with their parishioners in a Novena for the return of the Anglican Church to the Papacy.' Thus the fundamental question facing us is, *Does the Church of England intend to remain true to its character as a Reformed Church?* We have no doubt what the answer will be as soon as the English laity realize the way in which their Church is steadily being transformed.

We do not believe that it is yet too late to cancel the harm that has been done. Inter-communion with the Eastern Orthodox Churches upon a doctrinal basis has not yet been fully established. The Holy Synod of the Church of Rumania has not yet officially accepted the Bucarest Report; nor, of course, has it been accepted by the other Orthodox Autokephalous Churches. Indeed these Churches have not even yet replied to an invitation issued by the Œcumenical Patriarch in 1922 to hold a Pro-Synod of the Orthodox Church for the consideration of such matters as Re-union. If, therefore, some formula of warm welcome to our Rumanian brethren could be agreed to by the various societies of the Church of England which desire Reunion

on a primarily religious and not doctrinal basis; a formula emphasizing also—as the Archbishop's Commission which presented this Report was asked to do—the differences, as well as the agreements, between the two Churches; the basis for ultimate Reunion would be incomparably surer, and the liberalizing influence desired by the Rumanian Church incomparably stronger.

In the meantime we would warn English Churchmen against supposing that the character of the Orthodox Church in general is represented by the liberal nature of the Russian Orthodox Theological Academy exiled in Paris. It is not established that the attractive and learned works of Professors Bulgakov and Berdyaev find acceptance, or are even known, in the Orthodox Church as a whole. This of course would not matter, if only the Anglican Church could bring itself officially to be content with Inter-communion with any Christian Church that is sincere in its discipleship and can subscribe to the simple but far-reaching declaration that 'Jesus is the Lord.' But so long as this ideal —the only practicable as well as fully Christian one—is not embraced, and attempts at inclusiveness are made on the exclusive grounds of doctrinal uniformity, the Modern Churchmen's Union at least must continue to protest against the steady, though largely unobserved process by which the Church of England is being changed. The Union will thus also uphold its own published aims and objects, of which three are here particularly relevant. The first asserts the progressive character of God's Self-revelation. The second steadily rejects the deliberate use of traditional phrases which are open to ambiguous treatment. And the ninth upholds the principle of maintaining the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and fostering fellowship and co-operation with other Christian Societies.

Members of the Union would do well to read the official pamphlet, *What is the Modern Churchmen's Union?*, and to re-examine their membership in the light of it.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE APOSTOLIC AGE*

These five lectures on the Apostolic Age are well written, well printed and pleasant to read. We do not know any other book which covers the same ground in the same way.

The author divides the Apostolic Age into three periods; that from 30 to 43, in which the Church was a Jewish sect, unconscious of its mission; the period of the early Gentile mission, 41 to 70; and the period of world-wide expansion in which the Church perfected its institutions, 70 to 150. This scheme allows him to pass all the New Testament literature in review, to give his own ideas as to the origin of the gospels, and to show how the little sect of A.D. 30 became the Catholic Church of 150. It is astonishing how much ground is covered in 145 pages, and yet the work is readable and interesting, not a mere catalogue of facts and theories. As an introduction to the study of a very perplexing period it is admirable.

On the whole Dr. Barton takes up a conservative position, judged by the standards of to-day, but not all his views will command assent. His account of the events at Pentecost seems altogether unconvincing, and his harmonization of Acts IX and Galations II is hardly more so. Dr. Barton believes that Acts was written before A.D. 64, and therefore he is constrained to minimize the legendary element which makes this early dating seem improbable to the majority of scholars. Many more of his contentions are open to question. He believes that 'the Man of Sin' of II Thess. ii, 3 is the Roman Empire a very improbable identification. He ascribes to Apollos the authorship both of the Lucan birth-narratives, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews—a startling theory which could only be defended by a minute analysis of vocabulary and style. He accepts the generally discredited Ur-Marcus theory. He affirms dogmatically that the Apostles Peter and Paul were martyred in Rome in 64, though Dr. Barton's countryman, Professor Merrill, has shown that there is singularly little early evidence for this belief. Professor Merrill might also have corrected the idea that when Christianity ceased to be a *religio licita* it necessarily became an object of persecution on the part of the Roman Government (p. 118). The English language is enriched by a new word ('to envision') on page 130, and there are grammatical mistakes on pages 89, 123 and 135. But these are comparatively minor blemishes. Dr. Barton has given us a very useful book, and if some of its contentions are hazardous, it is none the less stimulating on that account.

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

A REALLY POPULAR CHURCH HISTORY†

On the day when this review was being written *The Times* announced the death of the author of the book. The Rev. A. Bevil Browne was for many years curate of Calne; here he showed that he could make the conclusions of scholars intelligible to ordinary people who, though not professional students, wish to know something of modern theology. When over sixty he offered himself to the Universities' Mission to Central Africa; and in July, 1936, he wrote from Likoma Cathedral the preface to this

* *The Apostolic Age and the New Testament.* The Bohlen Lectures, 1935. By George A. Barton, Ph.D., S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Language, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

† *The Way and the Faith.* By the Rev. A. Bevil Browne. (Macmillans. 6/-.)

book; and now after a few months of work in that mission field he has died; to those who knew his work in the diocese of Salisbury and elsewhere he leaves the memory of a scholar and a gentleman who was content to do the work for which he was fitted and at the end of his life produced a book that should meet a long-felt need. Mr. Bevil Browne states that his object is 'almost to make Church History interesting,' not indeed to the professional student (for whom many large histories are available), but to the intelligent layman who has neither the time nor the qualifications for being a student. The writer's wish certainly ought to be fulfilled, for in sixty short chapters he tells the story of Christian thought and church organization between the time of Christ and the council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 in a style which is both lucid and lively. Many an individual who has hitherto been only a name is likely to become a living personality through Mr. Bevil Browne's brief and telling descriptions. His theology is 'orthodox' and he does not disguise his admiration for Athanasius, but he is fair to those whom the official church has branded as 'heretics'; he is also able to show how some of these ancient heresies still mislead people who have never heard of such names as that of Eutyches. He does not 'whitewash' the many unpleasant ecclesiastics of early Church History; of Cyril of Alexandria he writes, 'in another age he would have been a triumphant Dictator or the efficient General of a society pledged to absolute obedience'; of Jerome, 'he was a rude old bear,' though he charitably adds, 'we must honour his industry and try to forget his vile temper.'

This book is not meant to get ordinands through the General Ordination Examination; it is meant for those laymen who wish to know how the Christian religion developed in the period after the close of the New Testament. The writer of this review does not know of any book which fulfils this purpose more satisfactorily; and it is to be hoped that before his death in Central Africa Mr. Bevil Browne received evidence from England that his work had been appreciated.

J. F. CLAYTON.

PSYCHOLOGY IN EVERYDAY LIFE*

It is natural that man should find the study of human nature a fascinating subject, for everyone is of interest and importance to himself, if to no one else. This is one reason for the popularity of books on psychology to-day. Another is that psychology has lately become a science. So long as it remained the abstract study of philosophers sitting in their armchairs, the average man found it neither very interesting nor very practical. What was written by the philosophers was hard to understand, and when mastered was neither very new nor of much use in daily life. But the scene changed so soon as the scientists took up the study. The facts about human nature which the scientists said they were discovering were certainly new, although the average man often denied indignantly that they were true, at any rate of himself. Furthermore they had practical importance, for up to a certain point they worked. Freud, for instance has been extremely successful in curing various forms of mental disease.

A general criticism passed upon many psychological theories is that they are misleading, because based upon work concerned with abnormal cases, the conclusions from which do not hold for average men and women. It is true that many of the discoveries of psychology have been made through the study of people suffering from mental disorders. But from them the psychologists have learnt much about the ways in which the average man or woman feels and thinks and acts. The true reasons for

* *Towards Peace of Mind.* By Karl M. Bowman, M.D. (Allen & Unwin. 6/-. 1936.)

many a man's actions are quite unknown to the man himself; but a trained psychologist can often discover them to him. In this way he helps him to understand himself better, and thus assists him to adjust himself more satisfactorily to the circumstances of his life. Various valuable methods have also been devised for testing the intelligence and capabilities of ordinary men and women.

The purpose of the book before us, *Towards Peace of Mind,* by Karl M. Bowman, is to give to the general reader some of the assured conclusions of psychology, those which are of practical interest in everyday life. Professor Burt, of London University, who contributes a preface, explains the scope of the book as follows:

> 'His (Dr. Bowman's)) object is to set out the established facts of human nature in such a way that the average man or woman may understand himself more clearly, and may be able to deal in a healthier manner with the personal problems that confront each one of us.'

Dr. Bowman is thoroughly qualified for this work. He is chief medical officer of the Boston Psychopathic Hospital, one of the best mental hospitals in the U.S.A.; he has had a very large clinical experience. He possesses a clear style, and an excellent power of exposition. He shows throughout a sane, well-balanced mind. He avoids riding any theory to death; he emphasizes the extreme complexity of human nature, the great variety of human character. He makes clear the dangers of rapid diagnosis, since the same symptoms may have different causes in different individuals. There is the same difficulty in treatment, for one patient will respond to a particular treatment, whereas another will not. Dr. Bowman illustrates what he has to say with very well-chosen examples from his wide clinical experience. His book is very interesting to read, besides being of great practical value.

In his opening chapters he deals with the general factors that influence human behaviour, heredity and environment, the glands of internal secretion and the effects of physical disease. He then discusses various modern theories of behaviour, those of Pavlov, Watson, Sherrington, Freud and others. This is not a very satisfactory chapter, since Dr. Bowman expounds these theories largely without criticism, so that the reader is puzzled to know the author's judgment upon them; though one must add that in succeeding chapters on instincts and emotions he makes some interesting applications of the theories already outlined.

He then deals with the special problems connected with the various periods of life, childhood, adolescence and adult existence. Here something might have been said about 'the change of life'; perhaps it has been omitted as being not sufficiently important. In an interesting chapter on fatigue and sleep, he quotes with approval the maxim: 'Never stand up when you can sit down, never sit down when you can lie down.' He is entirely against the Prince Consort's motto: 'Never relax.'

In his two concluding chapters he deals with the problems of sex and marriage, and of religion. These are the most important issues which the individual has to face. He says: 'It is not without reason that sex and religion are the two most common delusions among cases of mental disease.' The topic of religion is handled from the standpoint of mental hygiene. Dr. Bowman attempts to answer the questions, does religion help the individual to mental health, and if so, what type of religion? Here his conclusions are rather negative. He says that 'some individuals get along quite satisfactorily with no settled religious beliefs'; though he concedes that others are rendered able to bear the shock of, for instance, the death

of a friend, by means of faith in a future life; without such faith the shock might be unbearable.

Further on Dr. Bowman shows the harm done by special factors in certain types of religion, the appeal to fear, extreme emotionalism and too high standards of conduct. He quotes another psychologist, Boisen, as follows: 'The psychiatrist charges that the church requires of the human animal impossibly high standards, and that in its evangelistic efforts it works on the fears of men, and stirs them up emotionally and thus produces difficulties which come to him to be unravelled.' Dr. Bowman says that Boisen's' 'defence of religion is that it is religion's business to disturb men's consciences with regard to the quality of life they are living. He feels that it may be necessary at times to produce unpleasant effects in an individual in order to secure higher and better results.' So far as this relates to setting a high standard, all religious people will agree. Christians are convinced of the need for high ideals; from experience one knows that these have small power of appeal, unless one makes clear what practical steps to take towards the ideal. Ideals also should not be contrary to human nature. For instance, voluntary poverty and celibacy are not ideals, but they may be vocations for individuals.

Extreme emotionalism is certainly dangerous in religious appeals. The Groups, for instance, who make large use of such appeals, have often proved their dangers. Modernists and many others also would agree with Boisen in condemning the religious appeal to fear. But here Dr. Bowman's treatment of religion is defective, for he says nothing of the good effects on mental health which are produced by a religion teaching faith in a good and wise God, together with the optimistic outlook which such a faith inspires. Dr. William Brown, for instance, emphasizes the extreme value of a religion of love in the treatment of his patients. Dr. Bowman also would, it seems, disagree with Dr. Brown's conviction that 'everyone is at heart religious.' It is noticeable that none of Dr. William Brown's books are mentioned in the bibliography.

Everyone knows the story of the man who, after reading a medical dictionary, believed that he was suffering from every disease mentioned in its pages with the exception of 'housemaid's knee.' Such a person is not likely to gain 'peace of mind' through a study of Dr. Bowman's pages. But more normal people will find his book instructive and even amusing; they will learn from it much about their friends and acquaintances and something about themselves; it will make them better able to adjust themselves to the circumstances of life.

J. K. NETTLEFOLD.

THE VALUE OF RELIGIOUS DEVOTION*

The ever-increasing literature of 'religious realism' in the United States is being applied to more and more of the functions of religious behaviour. At first, in the writings of D. C. Macintosh, an outgrowth of a theory of knowledge, it became in the work of Horton more nearly theological, in that of Calhoun more in line with man at work, in the writings of Bennett in line with social salvation. But in each case, the result was the outline of a workable theology which would apply to these particular conditions. There has been a surprising unity of thought, despite certain rather obvious differences. Professor Wieman's earlier books worked directly from the findings of science and scientific method, and he still adheres to these principles; but his latest book is a new development in realistic thought.

* *The Normative Psychology of Religion.* By Henry Nelson Wieman and Regina Westcott-Wieman. Crowell. $3.50. 1935.

In this volume, in collaboration with his wife, who is a consulting psychologist, the pioneering effort is made to apply norms to the processes of religious behaviour. We see here, for the first time, the implications of both individual and social psychology for religion. The functional approach to religion can be understood in the light of the requirements which are presented as follows :—

(1) 'The degree to which the objective of devotion (*i.e.* God) is supremely worthful for all human living.

(2) 'The degree to which the total self is devoted to the objective.

(3) 'The degree to which the devotee promotes and secures the values of the objective.

(4) 'The degree to which the devotee acts with his utmost power of sensing and discriminating values in concrete situations.

(5) 'The degree to which the devotion of the individual progresses through his present highest objective in an emerging sequence of objectives of ever greater value.

(6) 'The degree to which the devotion pervades and shapes society' (pp. 39-40).

'Religion, at its highest and best, is the devotion of the total self, through search, adoration and service, to the highest Cause of which one is now conscious, provided that Cause is deemed worthy of the devotion of all men and is symbolic of ever higher unexplored values' (p. 80).

Religion cannot be reduced to morality or aesthetics. Taking the overworked and misunderstood term 'goodness,' we may say that moral goodness is *conscientious goodness,* aesthetic goodness is *arranged conduct,* while religious goodness is *spontaneous goodness* or *consecrated conduct.* There are two elements which run through all religions : *devotion* and *value.* To 'orient human living toward the supremely worthful is the functional significance of devotion and value' (p. 37). 'Supreme value,' to put it another way, 'is the greatest actual and possible connection between activities which makes them mutually enhancing and mutually meaningful' (p. 51). God is the supreme value. 'God is the *growth* of meaning and value in the world' (p. 137). In religion at its best, we find : (1) 'finer discrimination of value,' (2) 'concern for the development of personality,' (3) 'a socialized outlook.' Furthermore, ((4) 'greater wisdom and insight into values, meanings and purposes are fostered by excellent religion. It is only through the imagination that discoveries can be made. . . . But imagination alone does not bring wisdom' (pp. 80-82). We must have critical analysis, which is an evaluating process. Ever active inquiry must seek new values. The process is never done. This emphasis on growth and undiscovered values runs throughout the book (as in all realism).

Science, religion, and art use beliefs. They are sometimes called hypotheses, propositions, etc. Religion takes its beliefs very seriously, for they are the foundation of faith.

'Faith is a belief one lives by. . . . A worthy and workable faith will be a hierarchy, with a most general belief in supreme control over the living of the individual, and less general ones in subordinate places of control. The controlling belief will not be that God is this one particular kind of a being ; but it will be that there is a reality which is most inclusive of all values and hence supremely worthful. . . The more general a belief is, the more sure one can be that it is true, providing it is rightly formulated. . . . There are certain propositions so

very general that all experience testifies to their truth. Such, for example, are the following: I exist. Other persons exist. Nature exists. There are values. There is that supreme value which is most inclusive of other values, hence supreme value or God. . . . A noble faith does not bind. . . . It frees one to be critical, resourceful, inquiring, experimental' (pp. 109, 112-113).

There are chapters on the whole scope of religious behaviour, from sin, conversion and psychotherapy to missions, religious education and the social situation. These analyses are extremely keen. Professor Wieman has an unusual ability to bring out the significant factors in the puzzles which confront modern philosophy of religion. In her chapters on psychology, Mrs. Wieman shows a corresponding keenness. There is, however, a new element in the Wiemans' thinking which is extremely important. Recognizing the fact that religion must be one with life itself, it is shown that religion, church, and God cannot be separated from the problems facing us in industry, education, and statecraft. But the facing of this situation (which the church must face in order to exist) involves the dilemma of a culture-bound organization daring to criticize its own culture. Traditional religion is so involved with the vested interests that it cannot honestly criticize until it purges itself. On the other hand, individualistic religion and other new cults, lacking the balance of tradition, are likely to submerge themselves in ruthless destruction of the social order. The writers recognize, further, that religion alone can never remake the world; but the church can co-operate with the organizations of social science and politics; and in this combination lies our only hope for social salvation. Religion, as guardian of the heritage of the race, can provide that view of the 'long-run' which will prevent unbalanced upheavals within society. But such a church must be willing to recognize the need for change within society and within itself. 'It would be well for its leaders and members to start the change before it is done for them either by social force or social neglect' (p. 516). The church must formulate a definitely revised philosophy of religion; it must develop a normative psychology of religion (and both of these things the Wiemans are heroically attempting to do in this and future volumes); it must have a 'creative fellowship and an enriching heritage of religious meditation and insight' (p. 223). Without these guides, it is doomed to fall.

This book is a pioneering attempt to re-think our religious problems. It offers us a new point of view and refreshens our spirits. But traditional theists the book is doomed to disappoint. The concept of God fits admirably into modern phraseology; and it is consistent with the Wiemans' naturalistic premises. But the peculiar brand of theism which the Wiemans have developed lacks the fire of Christian theism. Can we pray to a 'growth' or an 'interaction'? Is a God which is impersonal a satisfactory religious object for our psychological needs? It seems to me not so. However, our religious thinking desperately needs to be critically analyzed, and perhaps the 'semi-theism' of the Wiemans will be an aid.

A careful reading of the book, however, may meet this criticism. A philosophic concept of God cannot contain the rich symbolism of religious 'over-beliefs'; and if we retain the right to reason beyond the accepted 'facts' of the philosophic concept, we may by analogy (which Wieman detests) argue our way to an acceptable position (as Calhoun does in *God and the Common Life*). The obvious religious feeling of Dr. Wieman, and his definitely helpful attitude concerning religious devotions, as expressed in past books, belies the abstractness of his philosophy and psychology. Both

Dr. and Mrs. Wieman sense clearly and devotedly the tragedy and glory of Christian living; and they see the dangerous crisis of the church and of mankind which is sure to come unless we face more realistically than ever before the problems which confront us. There can be no doubt of the religious and intellectual service of the Wiemans. They have cleared many cobwebs from the head of this reviewer; and if he is the less orthodox for having met them, he is certainly the more spiritually alive.

The book has value for those who would know the latest advances of the thought of Religious Realism; and the book is of especial value for teachers and students who would use it for a text book on the psychology of religion. The book is frankly protestant, but applicable universally. There is a useful list of definitions and distinctions. Each chapter has a full bibliography.

RANDOLPH C. MILLER.

IS SIN OUR FAULT?*

Mr. McDowall was chaplain and senior science master at Winchester, and well qualified to write for the educated youth of this country upon a topic which touches their personal lives closely. The book is notable for what to us seems a highly original view of human freedom, though it has something in common with the theory of 'self-determination' held by the late Dr. Rashdall, that great ethical teacher.

Mr. McDowall's starting point is the desire for freedom:

> 'Even the foolish are seeking freedom, though they seek it in impossible places, and have childish and wrong-headed notions of what freedom really is, often confusing it with slavery to an instinct.'

He reminds us that freedom is 'the very key-note of Christianity':

> '"With freedom did Christ set us free"; and St. Paul meant a great deal more by that phrase than mere freedom from the law. His freedom is the freedom of a unified personality which does not perpetually dissipate its energies by rushing now this way now that in response to the imperious dictation of an appetite or an instinct.'

The definition here offered of freedom is,

> 'The consistent, conscious direction of personal activity which springs from the whole character.'

Such freedom, it is pointed out, can only be 'self-won," and it must be 'won out of determined conditions in which there is no freedom.' We take it that the latter words mean that not only must the human being cope with a determined environment, but that *free* behaviour is based upon prior *regularities* of behaviour which have become for practical purposes determined. Just as the settled rules of a game, the laws of gravitation, and the automatic skill of the player contribute to his freedom in playing; so our environment, the ethical laws we accept, and our own self-discipline, all contribute to make our free behaviour.

Mr. McDowall draws an important if paradoxical distinction between freedom and free will:

> 'To talk of free *will* is really to separate the will from the act. This separation has been the cause of endless confusion, and is quite unjustified. Not the will alone, but the whole character determines our choices.'

* *Is Sin Our Fault?* By Stewart A. McDowall, B.D. (The Westminster Books. Hodder and Stoughton. 1936. 3/-.)

Freedom in short, must lie in the whole personality. To talk of 'will' as a separate entity is part and parcel of the old faulty 'faculty psychology' It is the personality which is free or unfree.

> 'Freedom is most clearly evidenced in the orientation of the whole self towards a certain stable and purposive pursuit of ends, which are approved. The free choice is the choice which is in accord with the whole tenor of the personality. *Being such it is not really choice at all.*'

This last seems a surprising statement — that perfect freedom should exclude choice. But, as a matter of fact, freedom 'comes to be seen as determining a kind of orderly congruity of action, and so suggests the *absence* of choice.' This is the psychological expression of the theological truth that the man under the influence of Grace is precluded from sinning.

Mr. McDowall sums up his view of freedom as follows:

> 'Our idea of freedom is an idea of activity directed by the *whole* personality. It implies the possibility of activity directed by *part* of the personality, and further implies that a man can choose whether the whole or the part shall determine his action. The existence of this power of choice, however, depends upon the fact that man has *not* achieved perfect freedom. Instead of his actions being perfectly consistent, he oscillates between appetite (for example) and personal consistency as determinants of his behaviour.'

And again:

> 'Freedom our analysis has shown to be the completely self-determined direction of the whole personality towards the harmonious achieval of some purpose. It involves no element of choice, for self-determination is complete. Such freedom can only be postulated perfectly of God, but it is essential to realise that the higher man rises, the nearer does he come to the possession of perfect freedom.'

It is stimulating to have the thorny free-will problem dealt with from the standpoint of experience and psychology rather than from that of metaphysics. Many writers enter that labyrinth and do not emerge from it again, and their hapless readers are left wandering in the maze. What we now need, having acquired a sound theory of the springs of human conduct, is a technique for educating those springs of conduct — something like the *Spiritual Exercises* brought up to date. But can the Church to-day produce a new Ignatius Loyola?

Meanwhile we recommend Mr. McDowall's valuable treatise to the attention of our readers. They cannot fail to profit from its perusal. And it is a book to buy and study, not to borrow and glance into. J.C.H.

SCHOOLS AND THE B.B.C.*

Mr. Whitehouse, who is chairman of the Society for Research in Education, pleads for an extension of the use of broadcasting in relation to education. The main suggestions now printed in the book before us were prepared for submission to the recent Royal Commission. But no opportunity was given for them to be submitted. The Commission, doubtless, had other things to think of. Among the very valuable suggestions offered were the following: A separate education station on its own wavelength; A weekly paper to be published for schools; A headquarters academic staff to be set up; The Board of Education to be officially

* *Broadcasting and Education.* By J. Howard Whitehouse. (Oxford University Press. 1936. 3/-.)

associated with educational broadcasting; No development to take place at the cost of the teachers, but the importance and the responsibility of the teacher to be increased.

It is to be feared that Governments are more interested at present in propaganda than in education. The education of the people might be an embarrassment to them. Thus it is not likely that Mr. Whitehouse's proposals will be adopted; but nevertheless, they should be read by everybody who is interested in education and the survival of culture. J.C.H.

THE CHURCH AND THE BOARDING SCHOOL*

In the county of Sussex there are about twelve thousand children of both sexes being educated in boarding schools; this is probably a larger number than in any other county. This fact has enabled the diocese of Chichester to experiment, and to appoint a special 'Bishop's Chaplain for Schools.' After four years' experience of this post, Mr. Winter has put some results and suggestions into a book, much of which is of value to those engaged in similar work.

The young people concerned may all be assumed to be the children of fairly well-to-do parents; that is to say, of parents the majority of whom in days past would have been members of the Church of England, and who would certainly have paid some attention to the religious upbringing of their sons and daughters. That, as we know, has largely changed. There are other changes. The headmasters of public schools are no longer, as a rule, in holy orders, still less the headmasters of private preparatory schools. In the past these ordained schoolmasters had received training which enabled them to pass on to their pupils some instruction in the meaning of Christianity and of Church membership. Now the headmaster is too often unqualified to do anything of the sort, and, occasionally, quite uninterested in any education other than secular. Other changes noted by Mr. Winter are the great increase in the number of these schools, especially of girls' schools, and it need hardly be added, the lack of home instruction in religion.

The author suggests that such religious instruction as is given fails to achieve its purpose. School chapel services fail to connect with the worship of the Church as a whole, and fail to instil any sense of worship as an essential part of Christian life. Much might be written of school chapel services, and those who have to conduct them know only too well their deficiencies: but those who look at them from outside often fail to realise the difficulties involved. But this accusation has much truth in it; yet perhaps only because the Englishman who is father of a family, and not only his sons or daughters, has little sense of being a member of a Church; and Christianity has often failed because it is too individualist. Yet a Christian must be brought up to show loyalty to Christ and to his Church; and often he leaves his school chapel with a sense only of the necessity of being loyal to his school. But until parents consider it their duty to pay attention to, and make enquiries about, the religious training of the school to which they are about to send a child, it is going to be hard for the child to consider it of any importance.

The author makes some practical suggestions, with not all of which is it possible to agree, and others of which have been ideals in the minds of educationists for some time, but are still some way from practical realisation. Much could be done to standardise religious instruction. Yet those

* *The Church and the Boarding School.* By the Rev. E. E. Winter, with Foreword by the Bishop of Chichester. (Philip Allan. 2/6.).

who have tried to get schools to work together on such uncontroversial matters as the Coronation holiday will hesitate before attempting standardisation even of a Divinity syllabus. Perhaps in this standardised age, however, too much importance may be attached to everyone knowing the same things. He is on firmer ground in advocating a closer co-operation between the three parts into which school religion is customarily divided; the scripture lessons, the services in chapel, and the preparation for Confirmation. The focal point will generally and rightly be Confirmation. This raises difficulties. Parents (who still have some say in the matter!) want their children to be confirmed at very different ages, and the school Chaplain, or whoever is responsible for the preparation, can do little to alter this. There is much to be said in favour of Confirmation for boys during the last year at a preparatory school, but only provided that religious instruction can continue; there is so much of the Christian life and its implications which is beyond the grasp of the boy of twelve or thirteen.

Mr. Winter's final suggestion is a valuable one and might well be acted upon without delay. The National Society, as recently reconstituted, is the body responsible to the Church of England for its educational problems, and should have a special permanent Committee to minister to this work.

Since the above was written, *The Times* (January 9th, 1937) has published a report of a conference held by the National Society at Chester. We regret that the important problems set by this book do not seem even to have been on the agenda.

W.H.O.

THE SCIENTIST SPEAKS*

The nineteenth century applied the sciences of physics and chemistry to industrial processes, and made possible wealth beyond the dreams of avarice. Had things gone according to schedule, the millenium should have put in an appearance by the twentieth century. But the time-table went wrong owing to the defects of human nature. Hence our present pessimism; hence also our present retreat from reason. Science has not brought about the millenium, therefore science is all nonsense, and reason, upon which science is based, is a will o' the wisp. Such is the argument to-day.

It does not occur to these defeatists and refugees from reason that instead of scrapping science they should proceed to carry it further. A little science is a dangerous thing. Physics and chemistry without biology and psychology land us in a mess by giving us control over nature before we have acquired control over ourselves. Human nature is more complex and less tractable than was imagined in the nineteenth century, which bred chemists but not psychologists. Thus our fathers over-simplified the problem. They thought that, given a cotton mill and a cheap loaf all would be well. It was all a question of *things*, not of *persons*. The trouble is that men will not settle down peaceably to run the cotton mill and eat the cheap loaf; they begin to fight and squabble. Envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness arise; men are acquisitive, stupid, and selfish. The lion will not eat straw like the ox.

What is to be done about it? The defeatist says, 'Nothing can be done. *Après nous le déluge.*' Others say, 'Revive belief in Catholic sacramental cultus.' Yet others, 'Join the Groups.' Either of the latter two answers is better than the first; but they are both unscientific, being based on rule-of-thumb, empirical theories of human nature, handed down from the past. Those theories are doubtless more realistic and less naive than those of

* *The Retreat from Reason.* By Lancelot Hogben. (Watts and Co. Cloth, 2/-. Paper, 1/-. 1936.)

nineteenth century social reformers who regarded man as a rational animal, but in reality they are about as able to cope with our present situation, as a muzzle-loader would be to knock out a machine-gun.

The fact is that it is no use trying to change human nature until you have discovered the laws of its change; and this has not yet been done. The biologist and the psychologist have something to teach us here, and will have still more in the future.

> 'Of human nature, as of external nature, Bacon's doctrine is equally true. To be commanded, Nature must be obeyed. The nineteenth century set out to change human nature without discovering its laws of change. It imposed new modes of behaviour on human beings without finding out how men must be educated if the new social pattern is to remain a stable one. . . .
>
> 'The social reformers of the nineteenth century complacently reflected that human beings are better and safer when there is less cruelty, less dirt and more privacy for those who want it. They believed, and rightly believed, that cruelty, disease and superstition are eradicable nuisances. Their weakness was that they completely failed to understand that, if eradicable, the love of cruelty, dirt and superstition is deeply rooted in human nature, fashioned as it is by our present social institutions and methods of education. During a century which saw an extraordinary limitation of cruelty in public life, nobody asked, and few have yet asked seriously, what kind of education makes people less likely to be cruel. The answer customarily given by educational reformers who advocate "free discipline" is not justified by anthropological research.'

Nineteenth century 'humane' civilization imposed restrictions without giving compensations; hence a growing sense of frustration everywhere, which D. H. Lawrence proposed to cure by a return to savagery, and which the Churches propose to cure by a return to superstition.

> 'While mankind had been forced to be less cruel and less pugnacious, it had not fully learned to enjoy alternative forms of excitement. While it had made great strides in the conquest of bodily disease, it was becoming afraid of the uses of the body. While the individual had gained the freedom to be alone, he had lost the means of escaping from his own loneliness.'

But the feeling of *malaise* which follows from the deprivations consequent upon civilization need not be treated by the dopes recommended by Lawrence, nor by a return to mediaeval barbarism tempered by mediaeval piety. Nor yet is it of any use to seek to persuade people by rational arguments (in the fashion of the pre-psychological nineteenth century) that they *ought* not to feel malaise. People can no more be cured of social illnesses by rational arguments than of physical illnesses by a sprinkling with holy water. The thing to do is to remove the causes of the *malaise* when they have been revealed by a scientific understanding of human nature and human needs.

Professor Hogben's small book is readable and should be studied by all clergymen, not because he expresses much sympathy for our ideals, but because the Church, at present supplying goods for which there is no demand (except perhaps from Mrs. Partington), might take the lead in a scientific study of human nature. But of course if St. Augustine has already told us all there is to be known on that subject, that closes the door on further inquiry.

J. C. HARDWICK.

AN APPROACH TO MYSTICAL THEOLOGY*

This book is the work of one who is now beneficed in the diocese of Birmingham and who would probably claim to belong to the rising school of liberal Catholicism within the Church of England. Within the compass of a little less than two hundred pages Mr. Cowley has given us an introduction to the study of Mystical Theology which not only has the merit of brevity but also that of being presented in a simple manner easily comprehensible to the ordinary person. The principal weakness of the book lies in its accumulation of quotations which, while bearing witness to the author's wide reading, becomes tedious at times.

No thinking Christian of any kind is entitled to wave on one side the experience and testimony of the saints, using that term in its widest sense. The age in which we live demands a new vision of God and the saints are those who have seen something of that vision and anything that helps us to share it is to be welcomed. The first chaper of Mr. Cowley's book is 'The Peace of God,' in which he declares that 'To be alone, at peace with God, is to know the heart of worship,' is one of the ablest and most helpful of all. He is psychologically sound when he speaks of the need to relax in the presence of God in prayer that the soul may be filled with that 'blessed serenity which comes from out the Divine Nature as a generous gift to those who would have God.' The new interest which is being shown in the Victorian era is due largely to the fact that although but a short period of time divides us from the Victorians, they were so very different from ourselves. Theirs was in many ways an age of leisure in which there was time to rest and think. If it was a self-complaisant age it was an age too of that 'blessed serenity' usually denied us in an age which, it has been said, 'has forgotten how to be still.' As Mr. Cowley writes: 'The old Psalmist's words are for ever true: "Be still and know that I am God."'

We have all heard *ad nauseam* that 'the modern man is not worrying about his sins.' The measure of the extent to which this is true, however, is the measure of the extent too to which he has lost the vision of the holiness of God. 'We are contented with ourselves,' said John Henry Newman in one of his sermons, 'till we contemplate Him.' 'The sight of God's Holiness,' says Mr. Cowley, 'at once makes man see his own unholiness and convinces him how far short he has fallen from the high mark set him by the Maker.' The Holiness of God once realized is the source of Christian struggle and endeavour on the side of good. We could wish that the author had dealt with this subject at greater length. In his final chapter, 'The Vision of God,' he says,

> 'There is a kind of homing instinct in man which makes him long to get back to God, only the homeward journey is so dark, and he is not quite sure of how to travel to that place where he meets God face to face. No book, not even Holy Bible, has the whole pilgrimage mapped out for him, so that he may never err or stray from the true and narrow way. Only "yonder shining light," the Kindly Light, the Inner Light of Christ within the soul, can guide him through in safety to Journey's End.'

That 'Kindly Light,' as Mr. Cowley points out, is the Light which shone on the hills of Galilee nearly two thousand years ago in the Person of Jesus

* *Pax Dei*. An Approach to Mystical Theology by Patrick Cowley, with an introduction by the Bishop of Southwark. (S.P.C.K. 4/-.)

of Nazareth, and so long as that is not forgotten mystical religion will be free from the dangers peculiar to it.

This book will serve not only as a useful guide to the whole study of mystical religion but will also be of use to preachers in search of new thoughts. Its publication is opportune, for Dr. Rufus Jones has recently stated that 'The two most powerful trends of present day Christianity are a fresh revival of mystical religion and an awakened passion to carry Christianity into the fabric and tissue of the social life of humanity.' We may add that Mr. Cowley is careful to show his awareness of this latter need.

W. J. CRATCHLEY.

THE MENACE OF ROME *

The Roman Catholic Church is as much a product of the Council of Trent as the Church of England is of the Elizabethan Settlement—that is to say, it is a product of the Reformation. And its contents are very mixed. It includes the civilized and enlightened English Benedictines, the highly educated English Jesuits (the ablest of them converts), Mexican ecclesiastics, converted intellectuals, patriots like General Franco.

Dr. Cadoux produces plenty of evidence that the Roman Church still persecutes where it has the power, and given an extension of power, there would follow an extension of persecution. Not that persecution is nowadays a monopoly of the Roman Catholic Church. Plenty of evidence is also forthcoming that the Roman Church well understands that propaganda is often more blessed even than persecution; and Roman propaganda is, within limits, very able. The Church is a good advertiser; and of course it has behind it the not inconsiderable forces in every country which stand for the social and economic *status quo*. Nor is the Church the only agency that gives newspaper editors and proprietors the cold shivers. If the Catholic Church can affect circulations, Big Business can reduce advertisements.

We probably have to make up our minds to the eclipse of toleration in one way or another for a generation or so (we shall be extremely lucky if it lasts no longer). Liberalism is in hiding. Nevertheless, a book like Dr. Cadoux's was worth writing, and should be read by all easy-going optimists. The Roman Catholic Church needs watching, not lest it should seek to advance itself by persecution in England, but lest it should secure a power in the spheres of journalism, politics and diplomacy which would enable it to thwart national progress and check the growth of religious enlightenment in this country.

J.C.H.

THE GOD WHO SPEAKS †

'Religion will not again be potent in the life of Europe until the belief is revitalized that God has a purpose and a plan — not only for the world, but for every individual in it, and for the minutest details in the life of every individual.' This is the theme of Dr. Streeter's latest book. He sets himself to show how the prophetic promise can be fulfilled, 'Thine ears shall hear a word behind thee saying, This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand, and when ye turn to the left.' He confesses that for himself he has found the purely intellectual approach to religion insuffi-

* *Roman Catholicism and Freedom.* By Cecil John Cadoux, D.D. (Independent Press. 1936. 5/-.)

† *The God who Speaks.* By B. H. Streeter. (Macmillan. 1936. 5/-.)

cient to overcome the world despair which has taken hold of the human race in the last two decades. A new response is necessary, and that response demands the fullest exercise of man's imaginative powers as well as of his will. It is not necessary that the individual must know the whole of God's plan, nor even the whole of it which concerns his own life; it is sufficient if he knows it for the day which lies immediately before him. Can he always know as much as that? Dr. Streeter says that he can, provided he is willing to take the preliminary step of straightening out in his own life that which he knows to be *contrary* to the Divine plan. If he does this, then he may confidently expect that he will hear 'the still small voice' of 'the Beyond that is within' telling him what is the next step.

'Thus there is an inner coherence between the conception of God's plan and the two convictions — that conscience is the 'voice of God,' and that certain intuitions, which come to the individual with an imperative quality, may be interpreted as "divine guidance"' (p. 21).

Granted that such guidance is possible to every man, yet its proper education requires both a 'standard of reference' and a 'stimulus to progress.' It is, therefore, coherent with belief in God's plan to believe that He has from time to time 'raised up' exceptional individuals who provide both these factors for more ordinary mortals. Such, for example, were the prophets of the Old Testament. In the next three chapters Dr. Streeter traces the prophetic line through the Bible. In the fifth chapter Dr. Streeter returns to his main theme in respect to divine guidance. He re-emphasises, in the light of the previous study of the Old and New Testaments, the principle that guidance must be sifted and tested in the light of the religious experience of the community before it can be accepted as authentic. In the Old Testament we see that criteria of inspiration are found in the moral content of the message given, in the ethical quality of the life of the reputed prophet, and in the extent to which the guidance received enables him who receives it to face the inevitable opposition to his message. So, also, in the case of St. Paul, we see that he judges of the gifts which his converts claim to have received both by the extent to which they conduce to the common good of the Christian fellowship, and by the manner in which they conform to reason and a sanctified common sense.

Finally, Dr. Streeter lays down what he believes to be the four necessary conditions, which qualify man at any level of religious experience to receive authentic divine guidance. The first is 'absolute devotion or surrender of the self to the Divine.' Second, 'self-knowledge, and the consequent admission of failure.' Third, a life lived in a fellowship 'within which mutual challenge, mutual encouragement, and mutual confession of failure are easy.' Fourth, the taking on oneself of 'some measure of suffering, sacrifice, or humiliation.'

It is obvious that this book, originally delivered as the Warburton Lectures, owes not a little to the writer's association with the Oxford Groups. Those who are not closely associated with the Groups, and perhaps have little sympathy with some of their methods, will be wise to acknowledge that the Groups, in laying particular emphasis upon 'guidance' and 'sharing,' have brought to the forefront of religious discussion two aspects of the Christian faith which form an integral part of the life of the Christian community. In this revived emphasis it is all-important that such eminent scholars as Dr. Streeter are able to guide and to share from their long-established experience and knowledge.

R.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE RECENT RESIGNATIONS.

SIR,

The Dean of St. Paul's has many friends among Modern Churchmen. I, for one, during about thirty years have watched his career with constant appreciation. The more, therefore, do I regret his recent action, and the action of his resigning colleagues, in leaving our Council.

We often have had constitutional differences of opinion, sometimes sharp or even violent, in the M.C.U., but we have always fought them out among ourselves. The present dispute might, in my judgment, likewise have been kept within the Modernist camp; whereas it was suddenly pushed over the boundaries into the vast publicity of the *Times*, spreading thence in all directions to our embarrassment and I believe—though I am perfectly sure that this was far from the resigners' intention—to our loss.

Happily, however, in a Society like ours such errors, if errors they be, are by no means fatal; rather are they a spur to greater goodwill and sacrifice all round.

HUBERT HANDLEY.

Golders Green, N.W.
March 10th, 1937.

SIR,

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the immediate occasion of the recent resignations from the Council of the M.C.U. was the adoption by the Council of the Memorandum on the Bucarest Report. The majority in favour of this was no less than twenty to three. It is important to bear this fact in mind lest the immediate issue be obscured by a wide and rambling discussion of more general considerations which may lead anywhere or nowhere. There are signs that this is already happening. As you have printed the Memorandum approved by the M.C.U. Council in your February issue, members of the M.C.U. can judge for themselves whether it is in line with the principles of the Union. Possibly exception may be taken to one point or another; but the Memorandum should be read as a whole and judged as a whole.

I will mention two points only. Modernism is forward-looking; the doctrinal statement propounded by the Rumanians as a basis for the recognition by them of Anglican orders is mediaeval through and through. The Report brackets Holy Tradition with Holy Scripture. Traditionalism is the very antithesis of the Modernism for which the Union has always stood.

The Memorandum has been discussed and approved by Branches in various parts of the country. In one Branch the fact that the Council had adopted the Memorandum resulted in the influx of a considerable number of new members. At a well-attended meeting on March 1st the Birmingham Branch passed the following Resolution by an overwhelming majority:—

'That this Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union approves of the Memorandum on the Bucarest Report.'

G. L. H. HARVEY.

The Rectory, Sutton Coldfield.

[At the largely attended meeting of the M.C.U. Council held on March 9th it was found impossible without violating the Constitution and Rules

of the M.C.U. to summon a valid Extraordinary General Meeting of the M.C.U. to discuss the recent crisis. Such a meeting can only be summoned by the President, and at the present time the Union possesses no President who will discharge this duty. The Annual General Meeting will be held in London on Thursday, May 27th, when opportunity for the fullest discussion will be provided and when many important decisions will be taken. It is essential for the future welfare of the M.C.U. that there should be as large an attendance of members as possible.—Ed., M.C.]

'TOWARDS A NEW LITURGY.'

Sir,

May a retired, aged parson, to whom a friend lends the *Modern Churchman,* suggest what he thinks would be an important substitute in two instances of the above?

(1) '*Which*'—the third word in the Lord's Prayer—is 'now used of *things* only,' so my dictionary affirms. As we speak *to* the Divine Person, is it not more appropriate that the personal pronoun 'who' should be used? Many clergy do this: I have done it for many years.

(2) *The Comfortable Words.* Why should not the Authorized Version wording take the place of that in practice at present?

In the first, does not 'weary' correspond with 'rest' better than 'travail' and 'refresh'?

And in the second, 'so' has no real meaning while commencing the sentence. Dr. Moffatt has, 'loved the world "*so greatly.*"'

The Canadian Prayer Book has the personal pronoun 'who' in the Lord's Prayer, but still has the old form in the Comfortable Words. Some years ago I suggested the alterations to an Archbishop in Canada, and also to the present Archbishop of York. Both agreed with me.

J. Harwood Little.

28 Wallace Avenue, Worthing, Sussex.
March 9th, 1937.

RE-DEDICATION OF THE NATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

Sir,

In connection with the Archbishop's call to a re-dedication of the nation to Christianity, may I emphasise two points for the consideration of the authorities of the Church, who seem to assume that the drift away from organized religion is entirely due to spiritual pride or other forms of moral obliquity on the part of the 'drifters' and not at all to any defect in the presentation of Christianity by the Churches. I am speaking especially of the Church of England.

(1) It should surely be openly acknowledged by the authorities of the Church that there is more than one legitimate interpretation of the divinity of Christ, and that belief in the Virgin Birth is not a necessity of the Christian religion. The Church would gain or at least have a chance of gaining the respect of those who value sincerity and mental honesty if the authorities ceased to appear to be unconscious of the fact that very many people in the Church, including communicants and many of the clergy, do *not* believe in the Virgin Birth. Then why not either say that these *cannot* claim to be Christians or that they *can?*

(2) The authorities of the Church must cease crippling its work and influence by refusing to women an opportunity for spiritual work on the same terms as men. At present their attitude seems to be that they would rather that spiritual work (especially that sort which calls out for women to do it) should be left undone rather than that it should be done by women.

23 High Street, Marylebone, W.1. THEODORE M. FAGAN.

Mr. NICHOLS AND HIS CRITIC.

SIR,

May I say that I think your reviewer in the February number is scarcely fair or charitable in his remarks on Mr. Beverley Nichols' book, *The Fool hath Said*. No one would pretend, least of all himself, that Mr. Nichols is a great theologian, but he is writing for the unlearned, and we must remember that it was St. Paul who said that 'it was God's good pleasure through the *foolishness* of preaching to save them that believe.'

As to the second part of the book, opinions may differ about the Group Movement, but I cannot understand anyone doubting the genuineness of Mr. Nichols' enthusiasm. All the cynicism of his earlier books has gone, and there is a triumphant joy in his new-found religion which many orthodox churchmen might envy. It must have required considerable courage to make such a *volte face*, and no doubt many of Mr. Nichols' friends and admirers joined with the lady who said that 'Mr. Nichols used to be such a good writer till he turned religious.' The better the sales, the better the cause of Christ.

WINIFRED M. PEARSON.

Hillsborough, The Heath, Petersfield.
March 4th, 1937.

MORE LIGHT ON THE M.C.U.

SIR,

As the affairs of the Modern Churchmen's Union are being discussed, might I offer one or two suggestions?

1. Could a brief history of the Modern Churchmen's Union be written, if that has not already been done? I suggest that for this reason. I am familiar with the work of some Broad Church leaders, some of whom I know personally. But I knew little of the Modern Churchmen's Union when I went out to India in the year 1908 or of its activities when I was in India.

2. Could the members have more information as to the doings of the Councils of the Union? I know little about them myself. But if it is permissible for a member to say what he would like this Council to do I hope that it will (*a*) take action when that promotes comprehensiveness, (*b*) refrain from action when that does not promote comprehensiveness. With regard to (*a*) there seems to me a great deal that wants resolute action. With regard to (*b*) I am a little uneasy. I notice that various members of the Union are Socialists, pacifists and various other things that I am not myself. It would seem to me in accordance with comprehensiveness that there should be people holding different opinions to my own, but I do not think it would promote comprehensiveness if I were expected to hold views I do not hold. In such matters liberty seems to me the right principle.

OSWALD YOUNGHUSBAND.

8 Gloucester Row, Clifton, Bristol.
February 21st, 1937.